NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCVII.

DECEMBER, 1889.

THE QUESTION OF DIVORCE.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, THE HON. JOSEPH P. BRADLEY, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, AND SENATOR JOSEPH N. DOLPH.

I UNDERTAKE, though not without misgiving, to offer answers to your four questions.* For I incline to think that the future of America is of greater importance to Christendom at large than that of any other country; that that future, in its highest features, vitally depends upon the incidents of marriage; and that no country has ever been so directly challenged as America now is to choose its course definitively with reference to one, if not more than one, of the very greatest of those incidents.

The solidity and health of the social body depend upon the soundness of its unit. That unit is the family; and the hinge of the family is to be found in the great and profound institution of marriage. It might be too much to say that a good system of marriage law, and of the practice appertaining to it, of itself insures the well-being of a community. But I cannot doubt that the converse is true; and that, if the relations of husband and wife are wrongly comprehended in what most belongs to them, either as to law or as to conduct, no nation can rise to the fulfil-

* The questions submitted as a basis for the discussion of the subject of Divorce, begun in the November number of THE REVIEW, are reprinted for the convenience of the reader. They are as follows:

1. Do you believe in the principle of divorce under any circumstances?
2. Ought divorced people to be allowed to marry under any circumstances?
3. What is the effect of divorce on the integrity of the family?
4. Does the absolute prohibition of divorce where it exists contribute to the moral purity of society?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of the higher destinies of man. There is a worm in the gourd of the public prosperity; and it must wither away.

I. On the first of the four questions I have to observe that the word divorce appears to be used in three different senses. First, it is popularly applied to cases of nullity, as in the world-famous suit of Henry VIII. This sense has only to be named in order to be set aside, since the finding of nullity simply means that, in the particular case, no contract of marriage has ever been made.

The second sense is that which is legally known, in canonical language, as divorce *a mensâ et toro*—from board and bed; and which is termed in the English statute of 1857 judicial separation. The word is employed apparently in this sense by our Authorized Version of the Bible (Matt. v., 32). The Revised Version substitutes the phrase "put away." The question now before me appears to speak of a severance which does not annul the contract of marriage, nor release the parties from its obligations, but which conditionally, and for certain grave causes, suspends their operation in vital particulars. I am not prepared to question in any manner the concession which the law of the church, apparently with the direct authority of St. Paul (1 Cor. vii., 10), makes in this respect to the necessities and the infirmities of human nature.

II. The second question deals with what may be called divorce proper. It resolves itself into the lawfulness or unlawfulness of remarriage, and the answer appears to me to be that remarriage is not admissible under any circumstances or conditions whatsoever.

Not that the difficulties arising from incongruous marriage are to be either denied or extenuated. They are insoluble. But the remedy is worse than the disease.

These sweeping statements ought, I am aware, to be supported by reasoning in detail; which space does not permit, and which I am not qualified adequately to supply. But it seems to me that such reasoning might fall under the following heads:

That marriage is essentially a contract for life, and only expires when life itself expires.

That Christian marriage involves a vow before God.

That no authority has been given to the Christian Church to cancel such a vow.

That it lies beyond the province of the civil legislature, which, from the necessity of things, has a *veto* within the limits of reason upon the making of it, but has no competency to annul it when once made.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That according to the laws of just interpretation remarriage is forbidden by the text of Holy Scripture.

[I would here observe:

1. That the declarations of the Gospels of St. Mark (x., 4), and St. Luke (xvi., 18), and of St. Paul (1 Cor. vii., 10) make no exception whatever.

That the language of St. Matthew prohibits absolutely the remarriage of a woman divorced or put away (*apolelumenēn*, not *tēn apolelumenēn*).

3. That the reservation found in St. Matthew only is reasonably to be referred to the special law of Moses, or what is here termed *porneia*.]

That, although private opinions have not been uniform even in the West, the law of the Latin Church, and also of the Anglican Church, from time immemorial, allows of no remarriage.

[Divorce with liberty to remarry was included in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* under Edward VI.; but that code never received sanction. In all likelihood it was disapproved by Queen Elizabeth and her advisers.]

That divorce proper, without limitation, essentially and from the time of contraction onwards, alters the character of marriage, and substitutes a relation different in ground and nature.

That divorce with limitation rests upon no clear ground either of principle or of authority.

[In England it was urged, on behalf of the bill of 1857, that adultery broke the marriage-bond *ipso facto*. Yet when the adultery is of both the parties, divorce cannot be given! Again, it is said that the innocent party may remarry. But (1) this is a distinction unknown to Scripture and to history, and (2) this innocent party, who is commonly the husband, is in many cases the more guilty of the two.]

That divorce does not appear to have accompanied primitive marriage. In Scripture we hear nothing of it before Moses. Among the Homeric Achaians it clearly did not exist. It marks degeneracy and the increasing sway of passion.

III. While divorce of any kind impairs the integrity of the family, divorce with remarriage destroys it root and branch. The parental and the conjugal relations are "joined together" by the hand of the Almighty no less than the persons united by the marriage tie to one another. Marriage contemplates not only an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

absolute identity of interests and affections, but also the creation of new, joint, and independent obligations, stretching into the future and limited only by the stroke of death. These obligations where divorce proper is in force lose all community, and the obedience reciprocal to them is dislocated and destroyed.

IV. I do not venture to give an answer to this question except within the sphere of my own observations and experience, and in relation to matters properly so cognizable. I have spent nearly sixty years at the centre of British life. Both before and from the beginning of that period absolute divorces were in England abusively obtainable, at very heavy cost, by private acts of Parliament; but they were so rare (perhaps about two in a year) that they did not affect the public tone, and for the English people marriage was virtually a contract indissoluble by law. In the year 1857 the English Divorce Act was passed, for England only. Unquestionably, since that time, the standard of conjugal morality has perceptibly declined among the higher classes of this country, and scandals in respect to it have become more frequent. The decline, as a fact, I know to be recognized by persons of social experience and insight who in no way share my abstract opinions on divorce. Personally, I believe it to be due in part to this great innovation in our marriage laws; but in part only, for other disintegrating causes have been at work. The mystery of marriage is, I admit, two profound for our comprehension; and it seems now to be too exacting for our faith.

The number of divorces *a vinculo* granted by the civil court is, however, still small in comparison with that presented by the returns from some other countries.

W. E. GLADSTONE.

IN REPLY to the questions submitted by the editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, I would briefly say:

As marriage and the family institution constitute the foundation and chief corner-stone of civil society, it is of the greatest moment that the marriage-tie should never be dissolved save for the most urgent reason. I cannot assent, however, to the doctrine that it should never be dissolved at all. Mere separation, though legalized, would often be an inadequate and unjust remedy to the injured party, who would thus be subjected to an enforced celibacy. This might suit the notions of those who regard celi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bacy as a virtue, but would fail to approve itself to those who take a wider and more charitable view of human nature.

The divine law which says, "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder," immediately adds an exception, "save for the cause of fornication"; showing—what the law of nature dictates—that the case is not governed by any iron rule of universal application. The law, "Thou shalt not kill," has its necessary exceptions, a disreguard of which would render it mischievous in a high degree. I know no other law on the subject but the moral law, which does not consist in arbitrary enactments and decrees, but is adapted to our condition as human beings. This is so, whether it is conceived of as the will of an All-Wise Creator, or as the voice of Humanity, speaking from its experience, its necessities, and its higher instincts. And that law surely does not demand that the injured party to the marriage-bond should be forever tied to one who disregards and violates every obligation which it imposes; to one with whom it is impossible to cohabit; to one whose touch is contamination. Nor does it demand that such injured party, if legally free, should be forever debarred from forming other ties through which the lost hopes of happiness for life may be restored. It is not reason, and it cannot be law, divine or moral, that unfaithfulness, or wilful and obstinate desertion, or persistent cruelty of the stronger party, should afford no ground for relief. The most rigid creeds to the contrary have found methods of dispensation from the theoretical rule. And if no redress be legalized, the law itself will be set at defiance; and greater injury to soul and body will result from clandestine methods of relief.

Yet so desirable is the indissolubility of marriage as an institution, so necessary is it to the happiness of families and the good of society, so pitiable the consequences that often flow from a dissolution, that every discouragement to such a remedy should be interposed. Not only should the judge take every care to see that just cause exists, but that no other remedy is possible. No jugglery or privacy should be tolerated, however high in station the parties may be. Investigation of the truth should be thorough and open, and should be a matter of public concern, participated in by the public representative of the law. It should be regarded as a *quasi-criminal* process, if not accompanied with criminal sanctions. Only serious and even severe methods of administer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the law will be sufficient to repress the growing tendency of discontented parties to rush into the divorce courts.

I think an answer to all your questions is involved in these brief remarks.

J. P. BRADLEY.

MY OPINION is asked in answer to the following questions:

First—Should divorced people be allowed to remarry under any circumstances?

Considering the interests of the public, which should be paramount in divorce laws, *Yes*, under all circumstances where the parties are neither incompetent to enter into another marriage contract nor incapacitated for performing their marital obligations. As there should be no partial divorce, which leaves the parties in the condition aptly described by an eminent jurist "as a wife without a husband and a husband without a wife," so, as a matter of public expediency and in the interest of public morals, whenever and however the marriage is dissolved, both parties, with the exceptions stated above, should be left free to remarry.

If punishment of the guilty party is necessary, some other method should be adopted. Punishment should be reformatory in its character and consistent with the interests of society. No prohibition and no law can change the instincts or control the passions, and prohibition of remarriage is likely to injure society more than the remarriage of the guilty party would. Such a prohibition is without effect except in the territorial limits of the prohibiting State, and is, therefore, of no practical value.

But considered merely as a punishment, and admitting that, having misbehaved in one matrimonial alliance, the guilty party has no claim to be protected in another, prohibition of remarriage would, in my opinion, be in many instances an unwise punishment. Take the case of a man divorced for habitual drunkenness, who has thoroughly reformed; of one divorced after sentence of imprisonment for life, who is afterward pardoned; of one convicted of felony, who has again won his way to public confidence; and even of a man or woman divorced on account of the most flagrant offence against the marriage relation, who is again treading the paths of virtue;—is not a punishment which dooms such persons to perpetual celibacy greater than it should be?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second—What is the effect of divorce upon the integrity of the family?

Of course, by integrity as used here "moral soundness" is meant. The question does not appear to refer expressly to collusive divorces and divorces obtained for insufficient causes under loose and liberal legislation or lax administration of the divorce laws in some States, but to divorces in general.

Whether a particular divorce promotes or injures the moral soundness of the family must depend entirely upon the circumstances of the case, the cause for which the divorce is granted, and the condition of the children, if any, before and after the divorce. A divorce may be a great injury to the moral welfare of the children, or it may be the only way to promote that welfare. It is evident, if one or both of the parents are unfit to have the custody of the children, and the influence of home is corrupting, that their moral, as well as their educational and financial, interests can be better cared for by the innocent party, freed from the interference of the guilty one, or by strangers under the direction of a Court of Chancery. Divorce for proper causes, free from fraud and collusion, conserves the moral integrity of the family.

No one can overestimate the importance of the family relation and the influence of home upon the rising generation. The family is the foundation of organized society; the institution upon which more than upon all others the character, prosperity, and stability of a nation depend. Let it be corrupted, and the influence which it exerts upon the young be for evil, and the best system of public instruction and the wisest legislation cannot repair the injury to society caused thereby.

The marital union should continue for life. The parties to it should faithfully perform the duties and scrupulonsly keep the obligations of the contract, that the institution may answer the ends for which it was designed—secure the happiness and promote the welfare of the parties to it, and the proper training of the offspring of the union. But suppose that by the misconduct of one of the parties the legitimate ends of marriage are frustrated, the happiness of the parties wrecked, and the influence of the home upon the children perverted until it is only evil. Which is wiser—to render the contract indissoluble, require the continuance of a legal union, with the misery and evil influences it perpetuates, or to relieve the innocent party of the burden of such a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

union, and place the children in the custody and under the care of those who will train them under better influences? Unquestionably the latter. There are many cases in which it is better for all concerned that the marital union should be dissolved, and in which the moral integrity of the family and the well-being of society are better conserved by a divorce than without it.

Prohibition of divorce can neither restore the bonds of affection, compel the actual union of husband and wife, nor restrain from infractions of the moral law. The difficult question is to determine what circumstances render divorce better in the interests of good government than the continuance of the marital relation. This should be the crucial test of all divorce legislation.

Third—Does the absolute prohibition of divorce where it exists contribute to the moral purity of society?

To answer this question as it should be answered would require more research than is possible with the limited time at my disposal. If the question were to be determined by a comparison of the condition of society in countries where divorces are permitted with that in which marriage is or has been held to be indissoluble, the question must be answered in the negative. Family morals in the United States, England, and Germany will certainly compare favorably with those in France, Spain, and Italy.

But a fairer comparison, where the other influences affecting the moral purity of society are more nearly equal, is made by Bishop in his valuable work upon "Marriage and Divorce." It is between South Carolina, where, until after the Rebellion at least, no divorces were allowed for any cause, and the States of the Union where divorces are allowed. The legislation and judicial decisions cited by him show a condition of things which might have been expected where divorce was prohibited. The proportion of his property which a married man might give to his concubine was regulated by law; and from the highest tribunal of the State the following vigorous protest against laws which prohibited divorce and at the same time punished adultery was made. In Cusack *v.* White, 2 Mill, 279, Judge Nott said:

"In this country, where divorces are not allowed for any cause whatever, we sometimes see men of excellent characters unfortunate in their marriages, and virtuous women abandoned or driven away houseless by their husbands, *who would be doomed to celibacy and solitude if they did not form connections which the law does not allow, and who make excellent husbands and virtuous wives still.* Yet they are considered as living in adultery, because a rigorous and unyielding law, from motives of policy alone, has ordained it so."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It does not appear that where divorce is refused it has prevented the wrongs for which divorces are granted in other countries. If parties who cannot or will not live together are not permitted to dissolve in law the bonds already sundered in fact, experience shows that they will form unlawful connections, and that public sentiment will largely justify them. The legislation that does most to discourage such connections, and to substitute for them legalized unions of the sexes, does most to promote moral purity.

There is much truth in the saying of an eminent French statesman in reference to prohibition of divorce, that

"laws to be obeyed must not do too great violence to our nature, which is always able to avenge itself upon the despotism of the law, either by crime, which is a violent reaction, or by corruption, which is a still but continued protest against despotism."

Fourth—What steps are necessary to procure a practical measure of reform?

This is the important question. Opinions are and will always be divided concerning the matters embraced in the preceding questions. Divorces will continue to be granted and prohibition against the marriage of the guilty party will continue to be, as it now is, exceptional. But a great majority of the thinking people of this country recognize the evils growing out of lax laws concerning divorce and careless administration of them, and the necessity for reform. The evils to be remedied may be stated in a general way as follows:

1. Laws authorizing divorce for insufficient causes, upon insufficient residence of the parties, and insufficient notice to the defendant.

2. Lax administration by the courts of the laws concerning divorce, admitting of collusion and fraudulent divorces.

3. Want of uniformity in the laws of the several States prescribing causes for divorce, concerning the residence of the parties and notice to the defendant, and in judicial decisions as to the force and effect of a decree dissolving the marriage contract.

The result of this lax and diverse legislation and loose administration of the laws is that parties who wish to avoid the more stringent laws of one State migrate to a State where divorce is easy, for the sole purpose of securing a dissolution of the marriage contract for causes, and upon notice and testimony, which would be insufficient in the State of their actual residence. The number of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

divorces continues to increase, many of which, held to be valid in the States where obtained, would be declared fraudulent and void in other States, and marriages by the divorced parties held to be legal in the States where the divorce was granted would be held to be bigamous elsewhere. If it is the husband who secures a divorce and remarries, the personal status of two women and the property rights of two families are involved. The first wife is still the lawful wife entitled to dower in the real estate of her husband in the State in which the first marriage was entered into, and probably in every other State except the one in which the fraudulent divorce was obtained. The second wife is entitled to dower under the laws of the State in which her marriage took place, and the children by that marriage are legitimate in that State, but elsewhere they are illegitimate and their mother is not entitled to dower.

What can be done to remedy these evils? The same steps are required that are necessary to secure legislative reform upon any other subject—agitation of the question, education of the people to bring about a healthy public sentiment, and a more careful administration of the existing laws in the several States, to secure legislation by the States limiting and more carefully defining the causes for divorce, providing better safeguards against imposition upon the court, and, as far as possible, uniformity in the laws of the several States, and the enacting by Congress of a stringent and uniform law upon the subject for the District of Columbia and the Territories.

But whatever may be accomplished in this manner, there will exist, as long as each State has the power to legislate for itself upon the subject, a want of uniformity in the laws of the several States, from which great inconvenience and confusion of personal and property rights will arise. We now have forty-two States. The population of all of them is composed of men and women of varying shades of opinion upon social questions; and the sentiment of the people of the different States, in the nature of things, is and will continue to be diverse upon the subject of divorce, making it inevitable that there shall be a corresponding diversity in the laws concerning it.

A most important measure of reform, at least a step greatly simplifying the problem, would be the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution granting to Congress power to legislate upon the subjects of marriage and divorce. It is the right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and duty of the State to prescribe the qualifications of parties to the marriage contract, the manner in which it shall be solemnized and authenticated, the causes for which it may be set aside or annulled, and the effect of the dissolution upon the personal status and property rights of the parties and their children; but there is nothing in the structure of our government to prevent this power being conferred upon the Federal Government.

Which shall legislate upon the subject, the States or the Federal Government, is a mere question of public convenience and welfare. A diversity in the laws on these subjects between independent nations gives rise to comparatively little confusion; but the relations between the States of the Union are entirely different from those between such nations. A citizen of the United States may be a resident to-day of one State and to-morrow of another; but his change of residence should be without change or impairment of his rights of citizenship or of his personal or property rights.

A recent writer upon the subject of divorce considers the securing of an amendment to the Federal Constitution empowering Congress to legislate upon marriage and divorce impracticable; and it may prove to be so. It certainly is encompassed with difficulties. The same writer seems to think that it is practicable to secure uniformity of legislation upon the subject in the several States by agreement. But if the proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution is impracticable, a scheme for securing uniform legislation through the coöperation of the States is visionary. The one plan requires the consent of all the States, and promises no permanency, while the other requires the consent of only three-fourths of the States, and if accomplished would be permanent. Even if concert of action by State legislatures could be secured, the uniformity could not be preserved, as one cannot bind another.

The difficulties of securing such an amendment are not as great as have been imagined. The feeling of antagonism between the Federal and State governments is largely dying out. As a rule, however proud the citizen is of his State, he is quite as proud of being a citizen of the United States. However jealous he is of the rights of his State, he is quite as much so of the rights of his greater country, which embraces all the States and exercises its legitimate powers over every foot of territory and upon every citizen of the Union. Let it be clearly shown that Congress can best legislate in the interests of the whole people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the subject, and the people and their representatives, the legislative assemblies, can be trusted to authorize it.

The objections to such an amendment have been magnified. It has been claimed that, if Congress is empowered to legislate upon the subject of marriage and divorce, "it will eventually absorb all the powers incidental to the subject." Congress could exercise only such express powers as were granted by the amendment, and powers necessarily implied in the express grant. It is true that the United States courts would have jurisdiction to enforce the laws which Congress might enact under such an amendment. That jurisdiction, however, would extend only to cases brought under those laws, and to cases in which some question arising under them was involved. Such an amendment would not, as has been supposed, confer upon Congress or the United States courts jurisdiction over the other relations of "husband and wife," over the relations of "parent and child," of "dower and courtesy," of "the law of descent," or of "the law of distribution." Jurisdiction on these subjects would be left where it now is—with the States. Divorces might be left to the State courts, if neither party chose to resort to the Federal tribunals.

But suppose such an amendment would involve the surrender by the States of jurisdiction of all the matters claimed by those who oppose such amendment. That would not necessarily be an argument against its adoption. The real question would still be whether it would be better for the whole people of the United States, in order to secure uniformity in the laws regulating marriage and divorce, and in the status and property rights of divorced parties and their children, that the Federal Government should possess the additional power proposed by the amendment. The Constitution was wisely framed, and was well adapted to the purposes for which it was intended at the time it was adopted; but to contend that it is too sacred to be amended in any particular is absurd. It was the creature of the people; it is subject to change when they will it. Provision was wisely made for its amendment as experience should dictate. Amendments may be proposed by Congress, but their adoption rests alone with the States. An amendment which secures the concurrence of three-fourths of the States must represent the will of the large majority of the people of the Union who are to be governed by it, and has a strong presumption of merit in its favor.

J. N. Dolph.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A REPLY TO MR. EDISON.

BY GEORGE WESTINGHOUSE, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC COMPANY.

No one will now question the great benefit of the electric light to the public. By the rays of the brilliant arc lamp our streets are better lighted than ever before, with a corresponding increase in security both to life and property, while the incandescent lamp supplies our homes with the most agreeable artificial illumination known to science, and one which, at the same time, is absolutely free from the deleterious products of combustion incident to the use of gas or oil.

The use of electricity for supplying light and power has now become as much a part of our every-day life as the railway, the steamship, the street-car, or the gas supply. In fact, we live in a time when power is made in every way subservient to the comfort of the people. It is employed in nearly every useful industry, with a full knowledge that such employment has been and always must be attended with an appreciable degree of danger. Electricity is one manifestation of power. It represents a form of mechanical energy capable of being utilized for innumerable purposes. Indeed, were it a question of prohibiting the use not merely of electricity, but of all other things dangerous to life, we would no longer have fires to warm us or light to enable us to see, and, in fact, would be deprived of most of the necessaries and comforts of existence. As has been the case with the utilization of all other forms of energy, the demand for the most economical methods will ultimately prevail, provided these can be made safe, as they most certainly can, by the exercise of proper precautions.

Electric lighting, unlike many other industries protected by patents, has been followed with keen interest at every step by the public at large, but among more immediately interested par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties the struggle for the control of the electric light and power business has never been exceeded in bitterness by any of the historical commercial controversies of a former day. Thousands of persons have large pecuniary interests at stake, and, as might be expected, many of them view this great subject solely from the stand-point of self-interest. That the public may to some extent understand the mass of literature now being printed with reference to the use of electric currents of both high and low tension, it is necessary that something of the story of this business rivalry should be told.

The successful use of the Jablochkoff electric light in Paris, in 1878, was the beginning of a new era in a field which had not remained wholly uncultivated during the preceding thirty years, although with unimportant commercial results. In 1877 and 1878 we find William E. Sawyer, Charles F. Brush, Hiram S. Maxim, Edward Weston, Thomas A. Edison, and others entering this alluring field of invention. In 1877 Sawyer took out three patents of more than ordinary importance in view of what has since become the practice in electric lighting. Early in 1878 he associated with himself Albon Man, who became a joint inventor with him of several electric-lighting inventions, the promising results from which led to the formation, on July 8 of that year, of the Electro-Dynamic Light Company of New York. The objects for which this company was formed were stated as follows:

"The production of light and power by means of electricity; the lighting of streets, buildings, and other places; producing, conducting, and distributing electrical currents for lighting and other purposes, and the manufacture and sale of all machinery necessary for or adapted to accomplish the purposes named."

Charles F. Brush early invented and perfected a dynamo, an arc lamp, and a method of operation whereby a number of such arc lamps could be used on one circuit, principally for street-lighting purposes. To make and sell Mr. Brush's inventions, there was organized the Brush Electric-Light Company, of Cleveland, Ohio.

In September, 1878, appeared the first announcement of Mr. Edison's discoveries in electric lighting, and on October 17, three months after the formation of the Electro-Dynamic Company to operate Sawyer and Man's electric-light inventions, the Edison Electric-Light Company, of New York, was organized. To introduce the inventions of Maxim and Weston, there was formed the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States Electric-Lighting Company, of New York, and thus four large corporations were started almost simultaneously upon a career of competitive business. The energy and money since expended by each of these corporations in efforts to thwart the progress of the others has mutually embittered the interested parties to a degree that can with difficulty be comprehended by those not immediately concerned in the strife.

Mr. Edison, already a well-known inventor in telegraphy, apparently had his attention drawn to this subject by a visit to Mr. William Wallace, of Ansonia, Conn., in September, 1878. There he saw Mr. Wallace's dynamos feeding eight electric lights at one time, and also witnessed the transmission of power by electricity from the Naugatuck River, a quarter of a mile distant. The spirit in which he entered the electric-light business would seem to be indicated in the following extract from the New York *Tribune* of September 28, 1878:

"Mr. Wallace's machines produce electricity which can be made available for electric light." Mr. Edison continued: "I have let the other inventors get the start of me in this matter somewhat, because I have not given much attention to electric lights, but I believe I can catch up to them now." . . . "Now that I have a machine (Wallace's) to make the electricity, I can experiment as much as I please." "I think," he added, smiling, "there is where I can beat the other inventors, as I have so many facilities here for trying experiments." "If you can make the electric light supply the place of gas, you can easily make a great fortune," the reporter suggested. "I don't care so much for a fortune," Mr. Edison replied, "as I do for getting ahead of the other fellows."

Setting out with this determination, it is perhaps no wonder he has worked so energetically. Reviewing his inventions and utterances, it is evident that he believed from the beginning that the system of gas-distribution was the thing to be copied, and that electric conductors could be laid under the streets with branches or connections to each house, supplied by generators located in central stations; but this system necessitated the limitation of the electric pressure to that which the lamps could be made to endure—in practice about 110 volts. The formidable quantities of copper required to conduct the necessary volume of current at this low pressure soon led to the development of what is known as the Edison "three-wire" system of distribution, an improvement founded upon earlier patents of Sawyer and Brush. This system permits a pressure of 220 volts on a circuit equipped with 110-volt lamps, and requires for the whole installation only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one-quarter of the weight of copper conductors necessary with the two-wire system.

It must be constantly borne in mind that the pressure of this direct-current system is necessarily limited to 220 volts by the conditions of the lamp, and also that the underground mains in all directions are interconnected, forming what is termed a mesh-work, analogous to the gas-distribution system, but with very important differences, hereafter explained at length. The cost of copper required for mains of sufficient conductivity to avoid a decrease in light by reason of large consumption, even at moderate distances, was found to be prohibitive, and this fact necessitated a system of "feeders," through which the electricity is forced against a very considerable resistance. These feeders are connected at various points to the mesh-work of mains so as to maintain at such points an approximately constant pressure. The generators at the central stations deliver their product collectively into common feeders and mains, and with a large plant an enormous energy is constantly exerted in these mains.

Any plan of distribution involving the meshing of the mains underneath the streets, with all house wires connected directly thereto, is regarded by the majority of competent electrical engineers as in many respects radically defective; so defective, in fact, that, unless the use of alternating currents can be prohibited, it seems destined to be wholly supplanted by the more scientific and in all respects (so far as concerns the users or occupants of buildings) far safer inductive system. Apparently sensible of this, Mr. Edison does not hesitate to say: "My personal desire would be to prohibit entirely the use of alternating currents."

The fact that the shocking accident which has given rise to the present discussion was, in all probability, the result of a direct continuous current, and that the burning of the unfortunate victim may have resulted from a low-tension current used for telegraphic or power purposes, apparently does not deter Mr. Edison from his self-imposed task of proving the low-pressure system to be the only safe one. It is, nevertheless, a common practice of the Edison Company to use uninsulated overhead wires for its 220-volt current for the purpose of economizing first cost, although it is well known that such a current is capable of burning a body subjected to it as effectually as in the case of lineman Feeks, provided the skin be sufficiently abraded to diminish the electrical resistance of the subject.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Accepting Mr. Edison's classification of the currents used for electric lighting, let us discuss them as follows :

"*First*—The low-tension continuous current, with a pressure not exceeding 200 volts, used for incandescent lighting.

"*Second*—The high-tension continuous current, with a pressure of 2,000 volts and over.

"*Third*—The high-tension semi-continuous, or pulsatory, current, with a pressure of 2,000 volts and over.

"*Fourth*—The alternating current, with a pressure of from 1,000 to 3,000 volts and over."

The first is not dangerous when a person comes into momentary contact with one wire, but no one can endure its passage through the body when the contact is made "in the most effective manner." I have witnessed the roasting of a large piece of fresh beef by a direct continuous current of less than one hundred volts within two minutes. Any one having access to electric lights operated by the low-tension underground system in New York can easily prove to his own satisfaction how much credence ought to be given to the assertion that a current of 200 volts can be passed through the human body without producing uncomfortable sensations. Let him connect a tin pan to one of the electric wires, and place therein a thick piece of beef, and upon this a gridiron of metal connected to the other wire. The electrical energy exhibited in the steaming and cooking of this beef may possibly surprise the experimenter. If the current is from an underground main, the experiment may be varied by connecting the gridiron to a water-pipe with like results. With even less than one hundred volts it is painful beyond endurance to press firmly with the hands the brushes or any bright brass-work of the dynamo, or to grasp any metal connected with the wires.

That a continuous current of moderate tension may produce death when the connection is continued for even a short time is shown by the published record of experiments conducted by Mr. A. E. Kennelly at the Edison Laboratory. With a continuous current of 400 volts a dog weighing fifty-seven and a half pounds was killed in forty seconds ; and in another instance, with 1,000 volts of continuous current, a dog weighing thirteen and a half pounds was killed instantly. That an alternating current of one hundred volts, even when effectively applied, does not kill is shown by two experiments on another dog. A continuous current of 304 volts was applied for thirty seconds, and then an alternating current of one hundred volts for sixty-five seconds ; yet the dog was unhurt.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But mark this important fact: the so-called "alternating current" used for these experiments on animals was not the alternating current of commerce, but was an Edison direct continuous current made alternating by a "pole-changer," producing an effect incomparably more dangerous than the true alternating current under discussion, because of the exaggerated tension resulting from the partial discharge of the field-magnets of the dynamo, which act in this case like a Ruhmkorf coil of enormous dimensions.

The power of destruction residing in the low-tension current under certain conditions is best illustrated by quoting from Mr. Edison's own article, where he says:

"Near the corner of William and Wall Streets, New York, the underground conductors of the Edison Illuminating Company became crossed, and the current which was passing through them at a pressure of only one hundred and ten volts melted not only the wires, but several feet of iron tubing in which they were incased, and reduced the paving-stones within a radius of three or four feet to a molten mass."

He adds: "This system is so arranged that consumers are not affected by such accidents as these." But it is, nevertheless, true that every consumer is directly connected to the mains, so that it is evident that the reverse of this statement would have more truly represented the actual possibilities of the case.

Concerning the three other conditions of current referred to by Mr. Edison, he classes them, and rightly so, as dangerous to life, although momentary contacts have repeatedly been made with wires carrying 1,000 and even 2,000 volts of each of these currents, without fatal results. In fact, there have been hundreds of cases in which momentary contact with an alternating current of 1,000 volts and over, as well as with pulsatory and continuous currents, has resulted only in painful shocks, unaccompanied by permanent injury.

The reader of Mr. Edison's article who is unfamiliar with the alternating system of distribution would naturally infer that in practice the same voltage is carried on the house wires as on the mains, as in the Edison system; but such is never the case under any circumstances. In this complete disconnection of the street and house wires is found the reason of the positive safety both to life and property enjoyed by the users of the alternating system. It is one of the great advantages of this system that it admits of the use of high voltages for the street mains, and of wholly separate and independent currents, with absolutely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

safe voltage, for all wires within buildings—a condition which is infallibly secured and maintained by converters, or transformers, located in or near each building. Each transformer of electric energy is composed of two separately-wound and insulated coils, one of thin wire connected to the street mains, and the other of thick wire connected to the wires of the building. One of the most beautiful features of the alternating system is that when currents of electricity are sent back and forth with almost inconceivable rapidity through the coil of thin wire, there is induced in a neighboring coil of thicker wire an equivalent amount of electrical energy, but at the same time so modified that the voltage, which may be 2,000 in the thin coil, need be only fifty in the thick coil, the volume of electricity being as many times increased as the pressure or voltage is diminished. A current of fifty volts is used in practice, as it is now well established that lamps of this capacity are far more durable and give a better light, with much greater economy, than the 100- or 110-volt lamps. The two coils being absolutely separated from each other by effective insulation through which the current in the primary wire cannot possibly penetrate, it follows that the alternating system has an enormous advantage over the direct system in respect of absolute safety to the consumer.

It seems possible that the time is not far distant when the regulations governing the distribution of electricity will rigidly prohibit direct electrical connection between the street wires and the local service-wires inside houses, thereby excluding from dwelling-places all the dangerous effects possible to ensue from accidental leakages in the underground system.

The forebodings of Mr. Edison concerning the results of the leakage of current from the underground mains have perhaps been in great part suggested by difficulties experienced in the working of his own system. The Edison underground lines are made up of a great number of short sections of iron pipe, each containing a copper rod, with a plastic insulating material forced between the copper and the iron. These sections are about sixteen feet long and are laid in trenches, and united at the joints like gas-pipes. These pipes are usually laid above the frost-line, and are necessarily affected by changes of temperature, which cause the iron pipes to move at the joints. It is, therefore, not unusual to find that after a short time the electrical leakage becomes sufficient to light a number of lamps when connection

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is made between a water-pipe and one of the mains—a fact well known to insurance inspectors. The Edison Company continues to use this system, although cables are now made capable of withstanding 2,500 volts of either alternating or direct current with even greater security than Mr. Edison has been able to provide for the 220 volts employed in his low-tension system.

One of the most perfect cables of to-day is a copper wire covered with a thick insulation, over which lead is pressed with very great force, thereby expelling air and gases, and solidifying the insulating material between the lead and copper. There is then woven upon the lead a textile envelope saturated with a water- and gas-proof compound. The continuous sections of this cable reach from one man-hole to another, a distance of several hundred feet, and can easily be drawn in and out of the ducts provided for them. Where one piece of cable is joined to another, an electric connection is made and well insulated, then encased in lead, which is afterward soldered to the ends of the respective cables. A cable of this character is uninfluenced by changes of temperature and is subject to little deterioration. To guard against its being pierced by a spark of static electricity, a very simple device is attached to it, offering an easier path for the electricity than through the insulation.

One of the differences alluded to, as existing between the low-tension, continuous-current underground system and a gas-pipe system, is that with reference to leakage. A gas leak is local and incapable of producing effects at a distance. With electricity, however, the aggregate effects of all the leakages from an underground system may be suddenly concentrated at any point within that system, as by one of the house wires coming in contact with a metal pipe, and such a contact may result even from the work of a mouse; whereupon the leakage of the entire net-work, which may amount to a large percentage of the total current, will be concentrated, and the surrounding material affected (although perhaps to a less degree) in the manner described by Mr. Edison in the reference to the currents at the corner of William and Wall Streets.

The interconnection of the conductors for the purpose of reducing the original investment has, in another important respect, a contrary effect from the meshing of gas-mains. In the case of the latter, the fracture of a pipe at one place, while it may cause a considerable leak, does not necessarily extinguish the lights of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the consumers. The grounding of one of the wires of an underground circuit, however, affects the entire mesh-work; and a cross between the wires may extinguish the lights of an entire district for a considerable time.

As to the accidents from electric currents, the records of deaths in the city of New York show that there were killed by street-cars during the year 1888, 64 persons; by omnibuses and wagons, 55; and by illuminating gas, 23; making the number killed by the electric current (5) insignificant compared with the deaths of individuals from any of the other causes named. The placing of the wires underground would eliminate many of the causes of accidents from electric currents, and they may all be prevented by the employment of reasonable and well-understood safeguards. Mr. Edison's statement that the putting of the wires underground will, instead of diminishing, increase the danger to life, is little less than amazing, at least when considered in connection with his advocacy of his own underground system. The repeated and violent explosions of gas in the man-holes of the Edison system, and in connection with the underground systems of the telephone and telegraph companies, have certainly shown that electricity from any source, either from low-tension electric-light, telephone, or telegraph currents, either of which is capable of producing a spark, may be the cause of a serious catastrophe, although there is no doubt that the accumulation of explosive mixtures within these chambers can be effectually prevented. Inasmuch as Mr. Edison's arguments against underground wires generally are equally applicable to his own system, it would seem, logically, that, if his views are to prevail, all electric wires must cease to serve the public. The experience of the cities of Chicago and Philadelphia in the use of underground cables for high-tension currents, to say nothing of the large number of cables laid underground in Rome, Berlin, Milan, and in other cities, indicates that the success of properly-constructed underground systems, whether for currents of high or low tension, has been established beyond question.

There is one radical difference between the alternating and the continuous low-tension system which should be fully understood. It has been shown that in the alternating system the street mains are absolutely disconnected and detached from the house mains, while the low-tension system necessitates the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meshing of all underground mains into one net-work and the supply of the current to that system by a series of feeders. In fact, it necessitates at times the supply of an enormous electrical energy to supply the demand. With the alternating system the practice is not to mesh the wires, but to run independent pairs of wires connecting the switch-board in the station with the thin wires of the converters. These wires are designed to supply only about 1,500 to 2,000 lights per pair, and are made of such a size that there is no appreciable decrease in the lights at the farther end, even if there is a very large consumption of current. Each of these pairs of mains can, therefore, be provided at the station with safety devices which will instantly and automatically cut off the current in the event of a cross-connection taking an abnormal current from the dynamo. Such safety devices cannot be made available with the low-tension system.

Mr. Edison is, moreover, unfortunate in his reference to the use of electric currents abroad. Under the British Electric-Lighting Act of 1888 the Board of Trade has issued a set of regulations. Concerning high-pressure conductors it says:

"9. *High-Pressure Conductors to be Insulated.* Every high-pressure aërial conductor must be continuously insulated with a durable and efficient material, to be approved by the Board of Trade, to a thickness of not less than one-tenth part of an inch, and in cases where the extreme difference of potential in the circuit exceeds 2,000 volts, the thickness of insulation must not be less in inches or parts of an inch than the number obtained by dividing the number expressing the volts by 20,000."

It will be seen that these regulations provide not merely for 2,000 volts, which is double that used in the American alternating system, but for any voltage whatsoever which the electric companies may desire to carry.

In a recent authorized publication it is stated that the main characteristics of the Edison system are as follows:

First—Subdivision of generating units to secure reliability and economy of production.

Second—Meshing of distributing conductors in a common net-work throughout the entire area to be supplied, to secure uniform distribution.

Third—A system of special feeding conductors to apportion equally the supply of energy to the demand throughout the area covered by the system of conductors.

Fourth—A system of indicators to denote in the station variations of pressure at any point in the area of consumption.

Fifth—A system of regulation to compensate for any variation of pressure.

The main characteristics of the alternating system contrast

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with these in a marked manner. These characteristics may be stated as follows:

First—Large generators located in central stations at points convenient for coal and water supply, and away from residences.

Second—A series of mains running from the station, each set of mains having a capacity of not exceeding 1,500 lights, and each pair of mains extending to the station, so that the lines are only interconnected at the switch-board in the station.

Third—By reason of the limitation of the number of lights on each circuit, the leakage on any one circuit is reduced to a minimum.

Fourth—The interruption or burning-out of any one circuit can have no effect upon other circuits, the contrary being a most serious defect in a system wherein the wires are meshed.

Fifth—Absence of numerous and costly regulating contrivances.

Sixth—Ability to use within all houses a fifty-volt current, whereby the most efficient lamps can be utilized.

Seventh—Absolute separation of the street mains from the house mains, thereby preventing injury or danger from the leakage from the street mains.

Eighth—The use of a mechanical meter, which accurately records the entire electrical energy consumed in the house.

Ninth—The easy regulation of the current if required, so that the lights may be turned up and down without expensive and wasteful machinery.

There is not on record a solitary instance of a person having been injured or shocked from the consumers' current of an alternating system. This is wholly due to the fact that the converted current within the buildings supplied need not exceed fifty volts, and that the street mains and the house wires are absolutely detached from each other, so that there is no possibility of a shock being received from leakage or short-circuiting in the high-tension street mains.

The fire-risk from electricity is the one most to be feared. With the continuous current, whenever there is occasion to put out a number of lights by the movement of a switch, it not infrequently happens that a dazzling arc of blue flame is formed which has to be blown out. With the alternating system it is impossible to form any considerable arc, even if the switch controls a thousand lights, the rapid reversals of the current having the effect of preventing its establishment.

Mr. Edison's observations concerning the efforts of his competitors in the direction of saving in investment are no less applicable to the desires of the suppliers of his own system. At the annual convention of the Edison Illuminating Companies at Niagara, in August of this year, the following resolutions were offered by Mr. Gilbert, of the Detroit Edison Station:

"*Resolved*, That the Association respectfully call to the attention of the Edison General Electric Company the difficulties under which local companies are now laboring in consequence of the lack of

"1. An efficient and inexpensive arc-light system.

"2. An arc lamp which can be economically operated on the three-wire system.

"3. A flexible method of enlarging the territory which can be profitably covered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from their stations for domestic lighting *by higher pressures* and consequently *less outlay of copper* than that involved by the three-wire method.

"We earnestly appeal to the parent organization to supply these deficiencies."

The proceedings of the convention also contain the following:

"The address of Sir William Thomson, as president of the physical section of the British Association in 1882, contained this memorable passage: 'Nothing above 200 volts, on any account, ever should be admitted into a ship or house or other place where safeguards cannot be made absolutely and forever trustworthy against all possible accident.' This opinion accords with what Mr. Edison has always maintained—that in the long run every system will fail which does not (for domestic service) use a low-pressure current."

This is precisely what the alternating system supplies. The successful use of arc-lamps depends upon high voltages. Neither Mr. Edison nor any other person has yet been able to supply the requirements of the public by means of a low-tension arc-lighting system.

A careful consideration of the whole subject proves that it is possible to light all the buildings within a city by means of electricity distributed by an underground system, wherein there shall be no connection whatever between the underground system and the wires within the buildings. It has been demonstrated that an incandescent lamp operated by a fifty-volt current will give more light at a given cost than a 110-volt lamp; and, these two things being admitted, it follows that, if there are to be any restrictive regulations with reference to electric lighting, they might more properly be: *First*—That the electro-motive force within any building shall never exceed one hundred volts; *Second*—That no underground system shall be placed in electrical connection with the wires in the buildings; *Third*—That no underground system shall be permitted which does not provide for the renewal and repair of the mains without digging up the streets.

In conclusion it is worthy of note that for three years past the purchasers of apparatus for electric lighting, who are at perfect liberty to buy from any company, have, for the most part, preferred to use the alternating system, so that to-day the extension of that system for central-station incandescent lighting is at least five times as great as that of the direct current. If the opinion of these persons, who can have no interest except to purchase that which they believe to be the best, is of any value, then the alternating system has been demonstrated to be the one which can give to the public that which they so much desire—a safe, cheap, efficient, and universally-applicable system of incandescent electric lighting.

GEO. WESTINGHOUSE, JR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPUBLICAN TACTICS IN THE HOUSE.

BY THE HON. ROGER Q. MILLS, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM TEXAS.

As soon as it was known that the elections had given the present House to the Republican party, the leaders of that party began a systematic crusade against its rules of procedure. They have suddenly discovered that, instead of facilitating the majority in the despatch of such business as may meet their approval, the rules have thrown obstructions across their path that are always difficult, and sometimes impossible, to surmount. Recognizing the fact that party supremacy must depend upon public opinion, they have been persistently courting its approval of their charges, in order that they may have its support when they proceed to level the barriers in their way. No one questions the right of the majority to govern, nor their right to make the rules by which they propose to control the business of the parliamentary body.

The rules of the House are intended, primarily, to facilitate the despatch of business, but they are also intended, like other laws, to protect the weak against the strong. In the first paragraph of his parliamentary manual, Mr. Jefferson quotes with approval the language of Speaker Onslow, whom he characterizes as "the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons." Mr. Onslow said that the rules of proceeding, "as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority," and that they were "in many instances a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power." Mr. Jefferson adds:

"So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense, that, as it is always in the power of the majority by their numbers to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted, as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities."

Before these checks against irregularities and abuses are removed, it should be shown that the nature of power has changed, and that it is not now actuated by a spirit of wantonness. When that high standard of moral perfection is reached by Republican Congressmen, their Democratic opponents will throw no hindrances in the way of their progress.

The same argument now made against the rules of the House could be made with equal force against the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of all the States that compose the Union. All of these are but rules for the government of political societies; and in all of them there are obstructions thrown across the path the majority may wish to go. The founders of our government had been taught in the school of experience that the multitude clothed with unlimited power was as dangerous as the single despot; that arbitrary power was the same whether it resided in one or many. Therefore, to prevent those who were chosen to be law-makers from becoming law-breakers, they prescribed, in all the constitutions, boundaries beyond which they should not go. All these were useless precautions if majorities were not sometimes maddened by the lust of power and forgetful of the rights of the weaker party. In all these constitutions we see where the people, jealous for the preservation of their natural rights, have prohibited the government from interfering with the freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. We see where they have forbidden the passage of *ex-post-facto* laws and bills of attainder, and prescribed boundaries to Congress in many other cases. All these are constitutional obstructions in the way of the majority. The history of the world in all ages and countries proved that these obstructions were necessary to secure the rights of freemen against the abuse of power.

The demand for the removal of the limitations in the rules means that the party in power are fatally bent on mischief; that they have some desperate enterprise on foot that their prophetic souls tell them is beyond the boundary of rightful jurisdiction, and that in carrying it out they will meet with stubborn opposition. It is not believed that they desire to create an establishment of religion, or to abridge the freedom of speech or of the press; but there is good ground to believe that the wantonness of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power has suggested to them the necessity of doing some things that are as palpable violations of the Constitution as these would be, though they may not be so pernicious. The excesses which they will attempt will be such as are dictated by a conviction of party necessity. The measures for which the way must be cleared are such as will, in their judgment, secure party ascendancy. If it can be done, the rules will be so framed that all opposition will be silenced when they are ready to vacate a Democratic seat and give it to a Republican contestant, regardless of the vote of the constituency. And there will be no "scandalous scenes" when they are trying to pass bills to create returning boards to give certificates of election to defeated Republican candidates for electors and members of Congress. It is to prepare the way for the advent of this higher civilization that the rules have been indicted and arraigned before the bar of public opinion.

It is gravely said that the rules which permit what is called filibustering should be changed so as to prevent the scandalous scene that occurred in the House in 1882. There are two sides to that picture, and both should be seen before a judgment is pronounced. Mr. Tillman, a Democrat, was elected to Congress from the Second District in South Carolina, in 1880, by a majority of 8,036 in a total of 38,614 votes, and a Republican House unseated him and gave the seat to the defeated candidate of their own party. Mr. O'Connor, a Democrat, was elected to Congress from the First District in the same State, at the same time, by a majority of 5,272 in a total of 29,866 votes. He died before Congress convened, and Mr. Dibble was elected to fill the vacancy. Mr. Dibble was unseated and the place was given to the defeated Republican candidate. Mr. Richardson, a Democrat, was elected to Congress at the same time, from the same State, by a majority of 8,468 in a total of 31,816 votes: the committee reported that his seat, too, should be given to the defeated Republican candidate, and the House was proceeding to carry the resolution into effect on the 3d of March, 1883, when the gavel fell announcing the expiration of the Congress, and the unhappy contestant fell just "outside the breastworks." While these resolutions unseating the Democratic Representatives were before the House, the minority indulged in parliamentary tactics to defeat them, and the country can decide whether the scandal attached to the majority, who were engaged in an effort to rob the constituencies of three dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tricts of the right of representation, or the minority, who were engaged in defending them.

It may be true that filibustering was never known in election cases prior to that time, but it is equally true that there was no cause to provoke it. From 1861 to 1875 the Republican party had the Congress, and they had returning boards in the South to give certificates of election to their defeated candidates. Democrats could not filibuster against their admission when they were already in. Sheridan and Lawrence were elected to the Forty-third Congress from Louisiana, but the returning boards of that State gave the certificates to Pinchback and Sypher. They retained the seats till the last day of the session, when, late at night, the unanimous report of the committee, that neither one of them was elected, was adopted and the two Democrats were sworn in. From 1875 to 1881 the Democrats had the House, and they seated Republican candidates when they were elected, and there was nothing to provoke factious opposition. Democrats ought not to be too severely criticised by their opponents for employing filibustering tactics, for the lesson was learned from the Republicans.

In 1854, when the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was before the House, the Republican minority alternated the two motions to adjourn and to fix the day to which the House should adjourn, and called the roll on them one hundred and thirty-eight times. This is the first time these motions were ever used in that way, and never before in the history of the government had any measure proposed in the House provoked such angry feeling or aroused such bitter opposition.

In the Forty-third Congress the Republican party adopted the Civil-Rights Bill and urged its passage through the House. It met the united and determined opposition of the Democratic members, who denounced it as a palpable violation of the Constitution; and, as the minority had no other means of protecting themselves against the reckless invasion of the majority, they employed the tactics adopted by the Republicans in 1854. Again the majority changed the rules. The gag was adopted. The bill was passed, but the Democratic position was sustained by the Supreme Court, which declared the law unconstitutional.

In 1877 there was another notable struggle by the minority to prevent the theft of the Presidency. An act of Congress was passed to change the existing rule for counting the electoral vote.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A commission was created to lift the contest out of the murky atmosphere of politics and into a higher and purer atmosphere of patriotism. But it was found that politics, and not patriotism, controlled the decisions of the commission, and that it was organized to avoid the obstructions that would otherwise have embarrassed the way to the executive chair. When the plan was uncovered and the cheat exposed, the filibustering method of opposition was again employed, but, as in the other cases mentioned, it was unsuccessful, and Mr. Hayes was declared President; and when he was inaugurated, he sustained the Democratic remonstrance by deciding that Louisiana had gone Democratic for all the officers from governor down, though the same returning board that declared a majority for him declared it for all the Republican candidates!

The Republicans again have a majority in the House, but not large enough to insure the success of their schemes. They have again extraordinary measures to be carried through, and the rules must again be subjected to their manipulations. They have gotten up seventeen contests for Democratic seats. These vacated and given to Republicans would give them a working majority large enough to place beyond the domain of doubt the passage of such laws as will materially aid in preserving and perpetuating their party ascendancy,

They readily see that there will be no difficulty in making a rule to prevent dilatory motions, and that the Speaker whom they will elect will refuse to entertain or put such motions to the vote. But the great difficulty in the way is the quorum which the Constitution requires to do business. A minority of one-fifth of those present may demand the yeas and nays, and when they are recorded they must show a majority of the House voting on the proposition. It will require in the present House one hundred and sixty-six members to make the constitutional quorum. This rule cannot be changed, and with a margin of three over the constitutional requirement it will be very difficult, in so large a body, to keep in their seats the indispensable number. There are at all times a large number of absentees from sickness, business, or other causes. The perplexing question that will not down is how to obtain a quorum if the minority sit still and refuse to vote. This question has often been before the House.

In 1832 a resolution was submitted by Mr. Bates, of Maine, to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

censure Mr. Stanberry, of Ohio. Ex-President John Quincy Adams, who was then a member of the House, asked to be excused from voting on it. The House refused to excuse him, and Mr. Adams sat still when his name was called and refused to vote. Resolutions were offered and debated; inquiries were set on foot to discover the way to enforce the rule that required every member to vote; but it all resulted in sound and fury signifying nothing. They had "led the horse to water, but could not make him drink." The House, finding it beyond the power of a majority to compel the vote of a minority of one, dropped the whole subject, or, rather, laid it all on the table.

On the 24th of February, 1875, a motion was made in the House to reconsider a vote refusing to go into committee of the whole. The yeas and nays were taken, and the record showed that no quorum had voted. Among those present and not voting was the distinguished leader of the opposition, the Hon. Samuel J. Randall. Mr. Butler, of Massachusetts, said there was evidently a quorum in the House, and inquired of the Speaker if there was no way in which the House could compel a member to vote. The Speaker, Mr. Blaine, replied: "The chair knows of no way of making a horse drink, although you may lead him to water." Another member stated to the chair that Mr. Randall was in his seat and did not vote, and moved that he be compelled to vote. To this the Speaker replied: "If the gentleman will indicate any mode by which a member can be compelled to vote, the chair will be glad to enforce it." Mr. Butler attempted to show the chair the desired way, and offered a resolution that Mr. Randall be brought to the bar of the House to answer for contempt of its authority. The point was made that a quorum was required to adopt the resolution. Mr. Butler called upon the Speaker to declare the presence of a quorum, if he believed there was a quorum in the hall. The Speaker replied: "The chair cannot declare a quorum against a yea-and-nay vote." He said it would be an "utter absurdity" for the chair to put an opinion against a record on a roll-call. Mr. Coburn, of Indiana, proposed that, when the roll was being called and members were refusing to vote, the difficulty could be overcome by a member rising in his place and naming another as present and refusing to vote, and asking that a record should be made to show that fact. To that the Speaker replied: "The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very principle enunciated by the gentleman from Indiana has been the foundation, probably, for the greatest legislative frauds ever committed. The moment you clothe your Speaker with power to go behind your roll-call and assume that there is a quorum in the hall, why, gentlemen, you stand on the very brink of a volcano." Mr. Hawley, of Illinois, came to the relief of the bewildered majority, and asserted that he and every other member had the right to demand that every member should vote. The Speaker replied: "The chair denies that utterly." The chair repeatedly suggested to the majority the only solution of their troubles—that a majority of the House could transact business.

The remedy, therefore, was for the party entrusted by the people with the duties and responsibilities of legislation to remain in the House and make the quorum required by the Constitution. The responsibility is on the majority party to make the quorum, and instead of scolding the members of the minority for refusing to share in the responsibility of bad legislation, they should call their own delinquents to account for abandoning the post of duty.

There was a thorough revision of the rules of the House in 1879. The committee charged with the duty of overhauling the rules reported numerous amendments, all of which had the unanimous agreement of the whole. The gag, of course, was left out, as it had been taken out by the Democratic House in the previous Congress, and, not being in accord with the canons of Democratic faith, it was never restored in any of the Houses when they were in the majority. When the subject was taken up for consideration in the House, Mr. Tucker, of Virginia, who had grown weary of Republican filibustering, offered an amendment authorizing the Speaker to declare a quorum constituted whenever those voting and those present who declined to vote should together make a majority of the House. But his amendment met with so little encouragement from his own side, and such determined opposition from the Republicans, that he withdrew it to save it from defeat. Among those who spoke against it were Mr. Garfield, Mr. Conger, Mr. Hawley, of Connecticut, Mr. Robeson, and Mr. Reed. All of them concurred with Speaker Blaine that the majority party must make the quorum to do business; and that the majority of members present, when less than a quorum, can only compel the attendance of absentees, but can not compel the vote of a member.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the question arises in the mind, Why is it more necessary now than formerly to level the barriers? What great evil is threatening? What great good is to be accomplished? It is not difficult to penetrate the thin disguise that covers the real object so carefully kept in the background. The Republican party, for the first time since 1874, has the administration and both branches of Congress. In that year they lost the House by an immense majority. Two years later they lost the administration and the Senate. By the aid of the returning boards and visiting statesmen, the majorities in Louisiana and Florida against the electors of their party were revised away through the rule of "addition, division, and silence," and they retained the administration by a bold and shameless fraud, while a majority of the popular vote, a majority of the electoral vote, and a majority of the States declared for the Democratic party. In 1880, with a large expenditure of "soap," they made their way slick enough to slide in. In 1884 the ballot-box again declared for the Democracy, but in 1888, by an immense outlay of the sinews of war, they have the administration, the Senate, and the House. Having control of the three branches of the law-making department, they feel the necessity of throwing fortifications around them, and making their hold on power so strong that the ballot-box cannot dislodge them. To do this, they must revive the old returning boards that throw out the Democratic votes, and in all cases where it is important give the certificate to the Republican, whether he is elected or not.

The measure they propose is bold and revolutionary, and it remains to be seen whether they will succeed in passing it, and, if it is passed, what the popular verdict will be when it comes to be enforced.

ROGER Q. MILLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A GOOD WORD FOR JEWS.

BY KARL BLIND.

AT A TIME when wretched fanatics of the Stöcker and Schönerer type once more try in Germany and Austria to rouse the worst crusading spirit against fellow-citizens of the "Semitic race," whose forefathers have lived in the same country with theirs for a thousand years and more, it is always pleasant to look upon a picture of nobler conduct in days of yore. Men are apt to speak of the early middle ages as of an epoch of unmitigated barbarism. Yet no fact stands out more clearly from the corresponding chapter of history than that Jews, especially in Germany, enjoyed then far greater toleration, far greater rights, than in the centuries which followed.

It was mainly the wars for the recovery of the so-called Holy Sepulchre which brought about the change for the worse in the sense of religious persecution. Even then it took some time before the populace could be egged on to the most fiendish atrocities; for, truth to say, its heart was *not* in the cause of the crusaders. From so unimpeachable a source as the Chronicle of the Abbot of Ursperg we know that when these militant salvationists gathered together during the reign of Konrad III., the first Hohenstaufen King and Emperor of Germany, they were publicly sneered at all along their route through the different towns. The Abbot expressly states that well-nigh the whole German nation (*omnis pene populus Teutonicus*) thought the crusaders were seized with an unheard-of folly, amounting to a delirium (*quasi inauditâ stultitiâ delirantes*). This sarcastic attitude of large masses continued for a long time. Hence the crowd of would-be deliverers of a mythical Holy Sepulchre had often to run the gantlet of jeers and gibes, in which the Papacy and the whole organization of the church made a public sport.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was only by means of a continued system of terror that the Papacy then kept itself at its exalted height. This terror, however, was sometimes met by the firmest resistance. In the reign of the free-thinking Emperor Frederick II. of Germany (1215-1250), we find the notorious inquisitor, Konrad von Marburg, the forerunner of Hoogstraten, Torquemada, and other scourgers of heresy, busily engaged in purging Germany from reformatory aspirations. A reasonable state policy ought to have induced the Kaiser to put a stop to this infamous cruelty at once. In his own quarrels with the Pope, who employed against him the well-known language of wrathful theocracy, Frederick II. did not mince his expressions. He occasionally called the so-called vicegerent of God a "dirty priest," a "dragon," an "infernal beast"—words which were but counterblasts to Papal allocutions of equal strength. But all the while Frederick issued decrees for the persecution of the Waldenses, and allowed the inquisitorial agents of the Roman court to overrun the German kingdom for the purpose of burning heretics whose mild skepticism fell far short of his own advanced free thought. It was the Cæsarist vein in the gifted Emperor of the Swabian House, it was his jealousy of anything savoring of the independent, self-governing spirit of the people, which thus led him astray in practical politics.

Still, not only among the masses, but also among the landed aristocracy and the military knighthood of Germany, there was even then a strongly-developed anti-Papal tendency. Any one conversant with the political and anti-clerical part of our minnesinger literature knows that, three hundred years before Luther, this tendency found utterance in a number of lays almost as bold as anything written during the Reformation. Nor is the sequel of the policy of Frederick II., in the case of the Grand-Inquisitor Konrad von Marburg, less instructive. No government action being taken against the bloodthirsty priestly fiend, a number of knights one day simply fetched him out of his house, and then and there, with but scant formality, killed him like a mad dog. High-handed as the act was, Germany for a long time afterwards was not troubled any more by attempts to employ the practices of the Inquisition.

These rapid introductory remarks are made to give a truer picture of the popular mind of the early middle ages than is often to be found. The farther, moreover, we go back in that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

epoch, the better it is seen that persecution of people of the Mosaic faith only began and grew in connection with the persecution of Christian heretics or free-thinkers by the Roman Church.

In a recent valuable work on "The History of the Educational System and the Culture of the Jews in France and Germany (X.–XIV. Century),"* by Dr. Güdemann, a rabbi at Vienna, it is correctly stated that the Germans, for a long period after their conversion to Christianity, were by no means hostile to the Jews as a race or a religious community. The Christian creed, it may be remembered, had made its way in large parts of Germany with some difficulty. It took a thirty-years' war before the Saxons were finally converted by the sword of Karl the Great amidst horrible cruelties, and deprived of their ancient rights of self-goverment. For generations many of the professed adherents of Christianity were still, at heart, scarcely weaned from the belief in Wodan, Thunar (Thor), and Frick, or Freia. Nature-worship in the forest, on the hill-top, on the river-side, at brooks, and on the sea-shore was deeply engraved in the Teutonic mind. And so long as this personification of the forces of Nature still had a strong hold upon popular fancy, the descendants of the exiles and emigrants from Palestine were comparatively free from molestation—nay, even often held in considerable esteem. This is a point clearly brought out by Dr. Güdemann's book.

For aught we know, many of the early German converts have thought the story of their own Goddess of Love and of Balder's death—if it was current among them in the form we know from the Edda—to be remarkably akin, in its main points, to the account contained in the Romanist's new faith. For that very reason they may have remained somewhat skeptical as to the alleged crime charged upon the Jews. Altogether our German forbears, during their heathen history, had distinguished themselves by a spirit of fairness toward those of another creed. There is no instance on record of a non-believer in the Teutonic religion having had to drink the cup of hemlock or to die on the cross for the sake of his faith. Recent excavations in eastern Germany have shown that foreign merchants, Phœnikian or Etruscan, were buried

*Geschichte des Erzichungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Frankreich und Deutschland (X.—XIV. Jahrhundert). Von Dr. M. GÜDEMANN, Rabbiner und Prediger in Wien.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there, in gray antiquity, among our heathen ancestors, with the symbols of their own religion peacefully placed in their tomb.

"The first German Jews of whom authentic mention is made in history appear," as Dr. Güdemann phrases it, "at once in the best society." Karl the Great, though barbarously cruel against the Wodan-worshipping Saxons who resisted his imperial ambition and aggression, had a Jew of the name of Sedechias as his physician-in-ordinary. Among the ambassadors whom the powerful Frankish Kaiser sent to Harun Arraschid, or al Raschid, there was also a Jew of the name of Isaak. It was that "Semetic alien"—as some preachers of intolerance of our day might say—who chiefly aided in making the diplomatic mission a successful one. Furthermore, Karl the Great (Charlemagne, as the French call that Frankish Teuton conquerer) promoted Hebrew science in Germany by transplanting a Jewish family of scholars, Kalonymos, from Lucca to Mainz.

Again, the queen of Karl's son, Lewis the Pious, and many noble ladies of her court, were very favorable to the Jews. Highly-instructed Christian men of that time preferred the works of Philo and Josephus to the Gospels. Clerics themselves were often on the friendliest terms with Jews. Christians visited the synagogues, and declared that the sermons of the rabbis pleased them better than those of their own priests. Bodo, a priest at the imperial court, and another cleric, Wikelin, or Wicelinus, even became converts to the Mosaic faith. The latter went the length of justifying his step by a pamphlet in which he attacked the doctrines of the Christian Church. Siegebert, a renowned Benedictine monk at Metz, in the eleventh century, gave preference to the Jewish interpretations of the Bible on account of the superior learning of the Jews—a quality to which testimony was often borne in those days by church dignitaries of eminence. Clerics and monks learned Hebrew from their Jewish fellow-citizens.

When Adalbero, bishop of Metz (984–1005), died, he was sincerely mourned by Jews. Christians and Jews sang before each other the melodies of the church and the synagogue for the sake of mutually adapting them to their own divine service. Jews sometimes adopted Germanic names—even mythological ones, such as Fasolt, the name of a giant of the old pagan system of creed. There were intermarriages also between persons of the two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different creeds. Among the German peasantry and the common townsfolk a notion cropped up here and there that the Mosaic faith was the truer one. Throughout the German kingdom the commerce of the Jews was unrestricted then. They had freedom of settling in any part of the country. For their sake market-days were transposed from Saturdays to Sundays. In accordance with the practice of the time, Jews could buy slaves, nay, even receive them, by circumcision, into their own community—a habit which naturally led to some degree of intermixture of race. Though, from the point of view of the principles of humanity now prevalent, the custom of slave-buying has to be reprobated, the fact just mentioned, with the concomitant permission of a change of religion in the bondsman, shows that there was a remarkable latitude of action allowed to Jews, and no fanatic feeling at all against them.

Jews were then a most travelled race and preëminently in possession of the larger commerce. Their educational system and their literature were flourishing, judged from the standard of the period. At the same time, they felt themselves bound up with the life of the nation among which they lived to a far greater extent than was the case later on.

But the year 1096, as Dr. Güdemann says, is "entered in blood-red letters in the annals of the German Jews, especially of those of the Rhinelands." This was the year of the first Crusade. The grewsome persecutions which now began altered the Jewish character. It became timid, pedantically devotionalist, disheartened, superstitious, and pettily secretive—a change which, according to the author, left its traces for centuries. Small traffic and usury became now the means of sustenance for the hunted people, who often had to ransom themselves from the rapacity of the governing classes. Yet amid all this misery a nobler trait now and then flashes up; especially when the creed of the persecuted was touched by tyrannic, inquisitorial hands. Then, not seldom, a martyr's spirit manifested itself, all of a sudden, in the full proudness of its conscience.

There is a great deal of evidence among Christian writers and poets of the middle ages which shows that usury was by no means an exclusively Jewish offence. The rift created by persecution between Jews and Christians was, however, made still more evident by the inquisitorial campaigns of Pope Innocent III., and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by his decree that the people of Hebrew descent had to be distinguished from their fellow-citizens by peculiar garments. In this way a pariah caste was marked out for public contempt. Yet among the Jews in the German Rhinelands there were not wanting examples of martial bravery and of civic spirit. During a siege at Worms, in the thirteenth century, Jews fought even on the Sabbath, with the permission of their rabbis, among the defenders of the town. At Köln, in 1270, when the citizens rose against the oppressive rule of the archbishop, there was, according to a rhymed chronicle of Gottfried Hagen,

". . . der Jude, her Daniel,
Ein Kone burger und snel"—

that is, "the Jew, Herr Daniel, a citizen bold and daring." It is remarkable that the title of "her" (Herr), which was then as a rule reserved for men of noble origin, is given to him. The Bishop of Köln himself was so struck with the valiant bearing of Daniel the Jew that, when the latter had become his prisoner, he presented him to the victors as a model of bravery. In a campaign of Duke Adolf of Nassau in France, an almost incredibly large number of Jews—30,000—are mentioned as having formed part of the army. Though the statement is clearly an exaggeration, there can be no doubt of its having had a large basis of fact. It may be brought to recollection that in Spain, also, Jews performed good military service.

Among German minnesingers of the early part of the thirteenth century, there was a Jew, Süsskind, of Trimberg. He sang of the freedom of thought "which penetrates through stone and steel and iron; which goes quicker over the fields than the glance of the eye; which soars up into the air above all eagles." He, however, had already a sad experience. Repelled by the rising spirit of intolerance, he says in one of his poems: "I was on a fool's errand with my art; I will no longer go to the castles of noblemen that spurn me. I will grow a long beard of gray hairs, and live henceforth in old Jews' fashion. My mantle shall be a long one; and deep down under my hat I shall walk most humbly. Seldom shall I sing courtly song any more, since noble lords refuse me their liberality." The latter remark refers to the custom of wandering minstrels of those days earning their livelihood through free gifts presented to them by the high-born pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tectors of the poetic art. Walther von der Vogelweide and all the great mimic singers lived in the same way. It was the accepted rule of the time for the foremost members of the poetic guild.

There is another poem by Süsskind, reminding us strongly of Robert Burns's "A man's a man for a' that." In this he says that true nobility is not founded on birth or parchments, but on a person's noble sentiments, on his virtuous character. Where these are wanting, where vices prevail, the aristocrat's dress becomes a mere rag (*da mak daz adelkleit wol werden ze einem hadel*). But "him who cannot boast of a renowed family name, and yet steers clear of vice, and generously does his best, him I call noble, though he be not born in the ranks of the great." Principles and feelings like these show what might have become of the population of Jewish origin in those earlier days, had not the hand of the persecutor crushed these promising germs and committed atrocities at which Humanity veils her face in shame and sorrow.

Probably most persons ordinarily passing for learned might be questioned on Jewish literature, outside the Bible and its commentaries, without being able to give any author's name, except perhaps those of Maimonides and Spinoza—if the latter can be ranged at all within the circle of Jewish literature, properly speaking. Of the many men of Hebrew faith who, as disciples of the Arabs, devoted themselves to philosophy, poetry, astronomy, mathematics, medicine, and philology, few of the best-educated will be found to have heard so much as the names. Yet there is a perfect galaxy of distinguished Jewish men of that kind, even if we take only the period before the fourteenth century of our era.

As a contribution towards more universal knowledge Dr. Güdemann's work is a serviceable one. It is written with full learning, and at the same time in that laudable spirit of impartiality which extenuates nothing, nor aught sets down in malice. In the first part, the author describes the time from the foundation of Jewish science in northern France until the disputes which arose about the writings of Maimonides, who, like many of his faith in Spain, had taken his cue from the Arabs, then the exponents of Hellenic culture. A further chapter is devoted to the gradual decline of Jewish science in northern France through persecution and internal divisions until the expulsion of the Jews

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from France. The Jews inhabiting what is now southern France originally were in close contact, intellectually speaking, with their brethren beyond the Pyrenees, who were under the influence of the Arabs. In dealing with this point, the author remarks that the Arabs "lay in the fetters of Greek philosophy"; and he thinks "this Arabic influence produced the opposed tendencies of rationalism on the one hand and of mysticism on the other—both equally pernicious to Judaism and to science." We can understand such a remark from the author's position and calling, without certainly approving of it. On our part, we would rather say that rationalism and mysticism are ingrained in the differences of the human constitution, and we would prefer the former, beyond question, to any hardened system of creed. Irrespective of this point, however, which only occupies a few lines in the work before us, everything is put before the reader in a very fair and praiseworthy manner.

There are noteworthy passages on the close contact between various "heretical" sects among the Christians and the Jewish communities in the Middle Ages. Often there were, before the hideous inquisitorial persecutions had been ordered from Rome, religious discussions between men of the two creeds. Not rarely did Jews come out triumphantly in those debates by showing up absurd superstitions and priestly impostures. Readiness of repartee and knowledge even of theology, of the Hebrew as well as of the Christian, were to be found more among Jews than among ignorant Catholic priests and monks. This was so well understood that warnings had often to be uttered from priestly quarters against allowing Goliath to enter into an intellectual fight with David. Goliath meant the Roman Church; David the clever Jewish disputant. It is on record that the deception practised by priests upon their flock by means of a so-called incombustible "holy coat" (similar to the "seamless Holy Coat of Triex" of our times) was once exposed by a Jew in the middle ages. He disproved its incombustibility by burning it. A great charge against the Albigenses, the *Pauvres de Lyon*, and other Christian sects, was that they held spiritual community with the Jews.

The loose life led by the Catholic priesthood, which formed a strong contrast to that of rabbinical teachers, drew Christian heretics and Jews still closer to each other. The details of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gross excesses and debauches of the clergy in France—the bishops foremost among them—are such that it is difficult to mention them here. Of course, the oppressed laymen had to pay heavily for these lawless clerical pleasures, and therefore naturally rebelled against their dissolute shepherds. The torture-chamber and the stake were the means of overthrowing such opposition; and as Albigense and other heresy was thus cruelly dealt with, the Jews were at the same time enveloped in the fierce and fiery persecution.

At a moment when "anti-Semite" fanaticism is, unfortunately, once more rife in more than one European country, it is well to cast our eyes upon these historical pictures. From them we see how much better human progress might have been achieved had not the earlier friendly intercourse between Christians and Jews been ruthlessly interrupted by an hierarchical system which aims at universal dominion, both spiritual and political, and whose relentless teaching and practice even tainted the minds of not a few men of the subsequent Reformation. At the end of this nineteenth century, the ninth century stands out, in some respects, as an age of comparative enlightenment in the treatment of fellow-citizens of non-Christian creed. All the greater is the shame, and all the greater the necessity for combating tendencies of bigotry and obscurantism which are a disgrace to our age.

KARL BLIND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BEST FIELDS FOR PHILANTHROPY.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

THE reception given to the first paper upon this subject, to which our lamented friend, the late editor and proprietor of this REVIEW, was pleased to give the first place in the June number, has been most encouraging to its author, as it would surely have been to the editor had he been spared, for he was most deeply interested in the subject. As showing the unflagging attention which Mr. Rice bestowed upon his editorial duties, it may be permissible to tell that the manuscript reached him in the morning, and late in the evening of the same day he called to say that it pleased him so much that he had determined to publish it in the forthcoming number, instead of holding it for the succeeding issue, as had been intended. When urged to delay publication, that proper time might be given for revision, he declined. Had he complied, another than he, alas! would have had to stand sponsor for my thoughts. Only one short week, and our friend was at rest; his warfare o'er. He had played his part in life well; and yet how little is he, or is any one, missed upon the march! The race presses slowly on as before; another rises to take the vacant place; THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW shines on, a lamp still burning, to show the great army of humanity the pitfalls which it must avoid in order to retain what has been already conquered, and to light the paths which that army must tread on its way to future conquests. In the death of Mr. Rice we have another proof that in the progress of humanity persons are little or nothing; the race is all.

"The individual withers, and the world is more and more."

And yet it is much to me that probably the last manuscript our friend read, valued, and published was "Wealth." Perhaps

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

your readers will pardon me for recalling an incident connected with our last interview. Sitting in my library, Mr. Rice expressed a wish to hear the author read his manuscript. I read and he listened from beginning to end, making but one interruption. When the passage was read which stated that, of every thousand dollars spent to-day in so-called charity, probably nine hundred was unwisely spent, he exclaimed, "Yes, nine hundred and fifty! Make it nine hundred and fifty!" and it was so made. I cannot pass without paying a tribute to Allen Thorndike Rice. That I knew him is one of the sources from which sweet remembrances spring at times, when free from the roar and bustle of life.

While "Wealth" has thus met a cordial reception upon this side of the Atlantic, it is natural that in the mother-land it should have attracted most attention, because the older civilization is at present brought more clearly face to face with socialistic questions. The contrast between the classes and the masses, between rich and poor, is not yet quite so sharp in this vast, fertile, and developing continent, with less than twenty persons per square mile, as in crowded little Britain, with fifteen times that number and no territory unoccupied. Perhaps the *Pall Mall Gazette* in its issue of September 5 puts most pithily the objections that have been raised to what the English have been pleased to call the "Gospel of Wealth." It says :

> "Great fortunes, says Mr. Carnegie, are great blessings to a community, because such and such things may be done with them. Well, but they are also a great curse, for such and such things are done with them. Mr. Carnegie's preaching, in other words, is altogether vitiated by Mr. Benzon's practice. The 'Gospel of Wealth' is killed by the acts."

To this the reply seems obvious : the gospel of Christianity is also killed by the acts. The same objection that is urged against the gospel of wealth lies against the commandment "Thou shalt not steal." It is no argument against a gospel that it is not lived up to ; indeed, it is an argument in its favor, for a gospel must be higher than the prevailing standard. It is no argument against a law that it is broken : in that disobedience lies the reason for making and maintaining the law ; the law which is never to be broken is never required.

Undoubtedly the most notable incident in regard to the "Gospel of Wealth" is that it was fortunate enough to attract the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attention of Mr. Gladstone, and brought forth the following note from him:

"I have asked Mr. Lloyd Bryce (*North American Review*) kindly to allow the republication in this country of the extremely interesting article on 'Wealth,' by Mr. Andrew Carnegie, which has just appeared in America."

This resulted in the publication of the article in several newspapers and periodicals, and an enterprising publisher issued it in pamphlet form. It is now sold in Britain for a penny.

All this is most encouraging, proving, as it does, that society is alive to the great issue involved, and is in a receptive mood. Your request, Mr. Editor, that I should continue the subject and point out the best fields for the use of surplus wealth may be taken as further proof that whether the ideas promulgated are to be received or rejected, they are at least certain to obtain a hearing.

Before entering upon the question which you have proposed, it may be advantageous to restate the positions taken in the former paper, for the benefit of those who may not have read it, or who cannot conveniently refer to it. It was assumed that the present laws of competition, accumulation, and distribution are the best obtainable conditions; that through these the race receives its most valuable fruits; and, therefore, that they should be accepted and upheld. Under these it was held that great wealth must inevitably flow into the hands of the few exceptional managers of men. The question then arose, What should these do with their surplus wealth? and the "Gospel of Wealth" contended that surplus wealth should be considered as a sacred trust, to be administered during the lives of its owners, by them as trustees, for the best good of the community in which and from which it had been acquired.

It was pointed out that there were but three modes of disposing of surplus wealth, and two of these were held to be improper. First, it was held that to leave great fortunes to children did not prove true affection for them or interest in their genuine good, regarded either as individuals or as members of the state; that it was not the welfare of the children, but the pride of the parents, which inspired enormous legacies, and that, looking to the usual results of vast sums conferred upon children, the thoughtful man must be forced to say, if the good of the child

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only were considered: "I would as soon leave to my son a curse as to leave to him the almighty dollar."

The second mode open to men is to hoard their surplus wealth during life, and leave it at death for public uses. It was pointed out that in many cases these bequests become merely monuments of the testators' folly; that the amount of real good done by posthumous gifts was ridiculously disproportionate to the sums thus left. The recent decision upon Mr. Tilden's will, which is said to have been drawn by the ablest of lawyers, and the partial failure of Mr. Williamson's purposes in regard to the great technical school which that millionaire intended to establish in Philadelphia, are lessons indeed for the rich who only bequeath.

The aim of the first article was thus to lead up to the conclusion that there is but one right mode of using enormous fortunes —namely, that the possessors from time to time during their own lives should so administer them as to promote the permanent good of the communities from which they have been gathered. It was held that public sentiment would soon say of one who died possessed of millions of available wealth which he might have administered: "The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced."

The purpose of this article is to present some of the best methods of performing this duty of administering surplus wealth for the good of the people. The first requisite for a really good use of wealth by the millionaire who has accepted the gospel which proclaims him only a trustee of the surplus that comes to him, is to take care that the purpose for which he spends it shall not have a degrading, pauperizing tendency upon its recipients, and that his trust should be so administered as to stimulate the best and most aspiring poor of the community to further efforts for their own improvement. It is not the irreclaimably destitute, shiftless, and worthless that it is truly beneficial or truly benevolent to attempt to reach and improve. For these there exists the refuge provided by the city or the state, where they can be sheltered, fed, clothed, and kept in comfortable existence, and—most important of all—where they can be isolated from the well-doing and industrious poor, who are liable to be demoralized by contact with these unfortunates. One man or woman who succeeds in living comfortably by begging is more dangerous to society, and a greater obstacle to the progress of humanity, than a score of wordy Socialists. The individual administrator of sur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plus wealth has as his charge the industrious and ambitious; not those who need everything done for them, but those who, being most anxious and able to help themselves, deserve and will be benefited by help from others and the extension of their opportunities at the hands of the philanthropic rich.

It is ever to be remembered that one of the chief obstacles which the philanthropist meets in his efforts to do real and permanent good in this world is the practice of indiscriminate giving; and the duty of the millionaire is to resolve to cease giving to objects that are not proved clearly to his satisfaction to be deserving. He must remember Mr. Rice's belief, that nine hundred and fifty out of every thousand dollars bestowed to-day upon so-called charity had better be thrown into the sea. As far as my experience of the wealthy extends, it is unnecessary to urge them to give of their superabundance in charity so-called. Greater good for the race is to be achieved by inducing them to cease impulsive and injurious giving. As a rule, the sins of millionaires in this respect are not those of omission, but of commission, because they will not take time to think, and chiefly because it is much easier to give than to refuse. Those who have surplus wealth give millions every year which produce more evil than good, and which really retard the progress of the people, because most of the forms in vogue to-day for benefiting mankind only tend to spread among the poor a spirit of dependence upon alms, when what is essential for progress is that they should be inspired to depend upon their own exertions. The miser millionaire who hoards his wealth does less injury to society than the careless millionaire who squanders his unwisely, even if he does so under cover of the mantle of sacred charity. The man who gives to the individual beggar commits a grave offence, but there are many societies and institutions soliciting alms which it is none the less injurious to the community to aid. These are as corrupting as individual beggars. Plutarch's "Morals" contains this lesson: "A beggar asking an alms of a Lacedæmonian, he said: 'Well, should I give thee anything, thou wilt be the greater beggar, for he that first gave thee money made thee idle, and is the cause of this base and dishonorable way of living.'" As I know them, there are few millionaires, very few indeed, who are clear of this sin of having made beggars.

Bearing in mind these considerations, let us endeavor to pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sent some of the best uses to which a millionaire can devote the surplus of which he should regard himself as only the trustee.

First—Standing apart by itself there is the founding of a university by men enormously rich, such men as must necessarily be few in any country. Perhaps the greatest sum ever given by an individual for any purpose is the gift of Senator Stanford, who undertakes to establish upon the Pacific coast, where he amassed his enormous fortune, a complete university, which is said to involve the expenditure of ten millions of dollars, and upon which he may be expected to bestow twenty millions of his surplus. He is to be envied. A thousand years hence some orator, speaking his praise upon the then crowded shores of the Pacific, may repeat Griffith's eulogy of Wolsey, "In bestowing he was most princely: ever witness for him this great seat of learning." Here is a noble use of wealth.

We have many such institutions, Hopkins, Cornell, Packer, and others, but most of these have only been bequeathed, and it is impossible to extol any man greatly for simply leaving what he cannot take with him. Cooper, and Pratt, and Stanford, and others of this class deserve credit and the admiration of their fellows as much for the time and the attention given during their lives, as for their expenditure, upon their respective monuments.

We cannot have the Pacific coast in mind without recalling another important work of a different character which has recently been established there, the Lick Observatory. If any millionaire be interested in the ennobling study of astronomy,—and there should be and would be such if they but gave the subject the slightest attention,—here is an example which could well be followed, for the progress made in astronomical instruments and appliances is so great and continuous that every few years a new telescope might be judiciously given to one of the observatories upon this continent, the last being always the largest and the best, and certain to carry further and further the knowledge of the universe and of our relation to it here upon the earth. As one among many of the good deeds of the late Mr. Thaw, of Pittsburg, his constant support of the observatory there may be mentioned. This observatory enabled Professor Langley to make his wonderful discoveries. The professor is now at the head of the Smithsonian Institution, a worthy successor to Professor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henry. Connected with him was Mr. Braeshier, of Pittsburg, whose instruments are in most of the principal observatories of the world. He was a common millwright, but Mr. Thaw recognized his genius and was his main support through trying days. This common workman has been made a professor by one of the foremost scientific bodies of the world. In applying part of his surplus in aiding these two now famous men, the millionaire Thaw did a noble work. Their joint labors have brought great, and are destined to bring still greater, credit upon their country in every scientific centre throughout the world.

It is reserved for very few to found universities, and, indeed, the use for many, or perhaps any, new universities does not exist. More good is henceforth to be accomplished by adding to and extending those in existence. But in this department a wide field remains for the millionaire as distinguished from the Crœsus among millionaires. The gifts to Yale University have been many, but there is plenty of room for others. The School of Fine Arts, founded by Mr. Street, the Sheffield Scientific School, endowed by Mr. Sheffield, and Professor Loomis's fund for the observatory, are fine examples. Mrs. C. J. Osborne's building for reading and recitation is to be regarded with especial pleasure as being the wise gift of a woman. Harvard University has not been forgotten; the Peabody Museum, and the halls of Wells, Matthews, and Thayer may be cited. Seber Hall is worthy of special mention, as showing what a genius like Richardson could do with the small sum of a hundred thousand dollars. The Vanderbilt University at Nashville, Tennessee, may be mentioned as a true product of the gospel of wealth. It was established by members of the Vanderbilt family during their lives—mark this vital feature—during their lives; for nothing counts for much that is left by a man at his death. Such funds are torn from him, not given by him. If any millionaire is at a loss to know how to accomplish great and indisputable good with his surplus, here is a field which can never be fully occupied, for the wants of our universities increase with the development of the country.

Second—The result of my own study of the question, What is the best gift which can be given to a community? is that a free library occupies the first place, provided the community will accept and maintain it as a public institution, as much a part of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the city property as its public schools, and, indeed, an adjunct to these. It is, no doubt, possible that my own personal experience may have led me to value a free library beyond all other forms of beneficence. When I was a boy in Pittsburg, Colonel Anderson, of Allegheny,—a name I can never speak without feelings of devotional gratitude,—opened his little library of four hundred books to boys. Every Saturday afternoon he was in attendance himself at his house to exchange books. No one but he who has felt it can know the intense longing with which the arrival of Saturday was awaited, that a new book might be had. My brother and Mr. Phipps, who have been my principal business partners through life, shared with me Colonel Anderson's precious generosity, and it was when revelling in these treasures that I resolved, if ever wealth came to me, that it should be used to establish free libraries, that other poor boys might receive opportunities similar to those for which we were indebted to that noble man.

Great Britain has been foremost in appreciating the value of free libraries for its people. Parliament passed an act permitting towns and cities to establish and maintain these as municipal institutions, and whenever the people of any town or city voted to accept the provisions of the act, the authorities were authorized to tax the community to the extent of one penny in the pound valuation. Most of the towns already have free libraries under this act. Many of these are the gifts of rich men, whose funds have been used for the building, and in some cases for the books also, the communities being required to maintain and to develop the libraries; and to this feature I attribute most of their usefulness. An endowed institution is liable to become the prey of a clique. The public ceases to take interest in it, or, rather, never acquires interest in it. The rule has been violated which requires the recipients to help themselves. Everything has been done for the community instead of its being only helped to help itself.

Many free libraries have been established in our country, but none that I know of with such wisdom as the Pratt Library, of Baltimore. Mr. Pratt presented to the city of Baltimore one million dollars, requiring it to pay 5 per cent. per annum, amounting to fifty thousand dollars per year, which is to be devoted to the maintenance and development of the library and its branches. During last year 430,217 books were distributed;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

37,196 people of Baltimore are registered upon the books as readers; and it is safe to say that the 37,000 frequenters of the Pratt Library are of more value to Baltimore, to the State, and to the country than all the inert, lazy, and hopelessly-poor in the whole nation. And it may further be safely said that, by placing within the reach of 37,000 aspiring people books which they were anxious to obtain, Mr. Pratt has done more for the genuine progress of the people than has been done by all the contributions of all the millionaires and rich people to help those who cannot help themselves. The one wise administrator of his surplus has poured his fertilizing stream upon soil that was ready to receive it and return a hundred-fold. The many squanderers have not only poured their streams into sieves which never can be filled,—they have done worse; they have poured them into stagnant sewers that breed the diseases which afflict the body politic. And this is not all. The million dollars of which Mr. Pratt has made so grand a use are something, but there is something greater still. When the fifth branch library was opened in Baltimore, the speaker said:

"Whatever may have been done in these four years, it was his pleasure to acknowledge that much, very much, was due to the earnest interest, the wise councils, and the practical suggestions of Mr. Pratt. He never seemed to feel that the mere donation of great wealth for the benefit of his fellow-citizens was all that would be asked of him, but he wisely labored to make its application as comprehensive and effective as possible. Thus he constantly lightened burdens that were, at times, very heavy, brought good cheer and bright sunshine when clouds flitted across the sky, and made every officer and employee feel that good work was appreciated, and loyal devotion to duty would receive hearty commendation."

This is the finest picture I have ever seen of any of the millionaire class. As here depicted, Mr. Pratt is the ideal disciple of the "Gospel of Wealth." We need have no fear that the mass of toilers will fail to recognize in such as he their best leaders and their most invaluable allies; for the problem of poverty and wealth, of employer and employed, will be practically solved whenever the time of the few is given, and their wealth is administered during their lives, for the best good of that portion of the community which has not been burdened by the responsibilities which attend the possession of wealth. We shall have no antagonism between classes when that day comes, for the high and the low, the rich and the poor, shall then indeed be brothers.

No millionaire will go far wrong in his search for one of the best forms for the use of his surplus who chooses to establish a free library in any community that is willing to maintain and develop it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Bright's words should ring in his ear: "It is impossible for any man to bestow a greater benefit upon a young man than to give him access to books in a free library." Closely allied to the library, and, where possible, attached to it, there should be rooms for an art gallery and museum, and a hall for such lectures and instruction as are provided in the Cooper Union. The traveller upon the Continent is surprised to find that every town of importance has its art gallery and museum; these may be large or small, but in any case each has a receptacle for the treasures of the locality, which is constantly receiving valuable gifts and bequests. The free library and art gallery of Birmingham are remarkable among these, and every now and then a rich man adds to their value by presenting books, fine pictures, or other works of art. All that our cities require to begin with is a proper fire-proof building. Their citizens who travel will send to it rare and costly things from every quarter of the globe they visit, while those who remain at home will give or bequeath to it of their treasures. In this way these collections will grow until our cities will ultimately be able to boast of permanent exhibitions from which their own citizens will derive incalculable benefit, and which they will be proud to show to visitors. In the Metropolitan Museum of Art in this city we have made an excellent beginning. Here is another avenue for the proper use of surplus wealth.

Third—We have another most important department in which great sums can be worthily used,—the founding or extension of hospitals, medical colleges, laboratories, and other institutions connected with the alleviation of human suffering, and especially with the prevention rather than the cure of human ills. There is no danger of pauperizing a community in giving for such purposes, because such institutions relieve temporary ailments or shelter only those who are hopeless invalids. What better gift than a hospital can be given to a community that is without one?—the gift being conditioned upon its proper maintenance by the community in its corporate capacity. If hospital accommodation already exists, no better method for using surplus wealth can be found than in making additions to it. The late Mr. Vanderbilt's gift of half a million of dollars to the medical department of Columbia College for a chemical laboratory was one of the wisest possible uses of wealth. It strikes at the prevention of disease by penetrating into its causes. Several others

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have established such laboratories, but the need for them is still great.

If there be a millionaire in the land who is at a loss what to do with the surplus that has been committed to him as trustee, let him investigate the good that is flowing from these chemical laboratories. No medical college is complete without its laboratory. As with universities, so with medical colleges; it is not new institutions that are required, but additional means for the more thorough equipment of those that exist. The forms that benefactions to these may wisely take are numerous, but probably none is more useful than that adopted by Mr. Osborne when he built a school for training female nurses at Bellevue College. If from all gifts there flows one-half of the good that comes from this wise use of a millionaire's surplus, the most exacting may well be satisfied. Only those who have passed through a lingering and dangerous illness can rate at their true value the care, skill, and attendance of trained female nurses. Their employment as nurses has enlarged the sphere and influence of woman. It is not to be wondered at that a Senator of the United States and a physician distinguished in this country for having received the highest distinctions abroad should find their wives from this class.

Fourth—In the very front rank of benefactions public parks should be placed, always provided that the community undertakes to maintain, beautify, and preserve inviolate the parks given to it. No more useful or more beautiful monument can be left by any man than a park for the city in which he was born or in which he has long lived, nor can the community pay a more graceful tribute to the citizen who presents it than to give his name to the gift. If a park be already provided, there is still room for many judicious gifts in connection with it. Mr. Phipps, of Allegheny, has given conservatories to the park there, which are visited by many every day of the week and crowded by thousands of working people every Sunday, for, with rare wisdom, he has stipulated as a condition of the gift that the conservatories shall be open on Sundays. The result of his experiment has been so gratifying that he is justified in adding to them from his surplus, as he is doing largely this year. To any lover of flowers among the wealthy I commend a study of what is possible for them to do in the line of Mr. Phipps's example; and may they please note that Mr. Phipps is a wise as well as a liberal giver, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he requires the city to maintain these conservatories, and thus secures for them forever the public ownership, the public interest, and the public criticism of their management. Had he undertaken to manage and maintain them, it is probable that popular interest in the gift would never have been awakened.

The parks and pleasure-grounds of small towns throughout Europe are not less surprising than their libraries, museums, and art galleries. We saw nothing more pleasing during our recent travels than the hillside of Bergen, in Norway. It has been converted into one of the most picturesque of pleasure-grounds; fountains, cascades, water-falls, delightful arbors, fine terraces, and statues adorn what was before a barren mountain side. Here is a field worthy of study by the millionaire who would confer a lasting benefit upon his fellows. Another beautiful instance of the right use of wealth in the direction of making cities more and more attractive we found in Dresden. The owner of the leading paper there bequeathed its revenues forever to the city, to be used in beautifying it. An art committee decides from time to time what new artistic feature is to be introduced or what hideous feature is to be changed, and as the revenues accrue they are expended in this direction. Thus through the gift of this patriotic newspaper proprietor his native city of Dresden is fast becoming one of the most artistic places of residence in the whole world. A work having been completed, it devolves upon the city to maintain it forever. May I be excused if I commend to our millionaire newspaper proprietors the example of their colleague in the capital of Saxony?

Scarcely a city of any magnitude in the older countries is without many structures and features of great beauty. Much has been spent upon ornament, decoration, and architectural effect: we are still far behind in these things upon this side of the Atlantic. Our Republic is great in some things,—in material development unrivalled; but let us always remember that in art and in the finer touches we have scarcely yet taken a place. Had the exquisite memorial arch recently erected temporarily in New York been shown in Dresden, the art committee there would probably have been enabled, from the revenue of the newspaper given by its owner for just such purposes, to order its permanent erection to adorn the city forever.

While the bestowal of a park upon a community as one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the best uses for surplus wealth will be universally approved, in embracing such additions to it as conservatories, or in advocating the building of memorial arches and works of adornment, it is probable that many will think we go too far, and consider these somewhat fanciful. The material good to flow from them may not be so directly visible; but let not any practical mind, intent only upon material good, depreciate the value of wealth given for these or for kindred æsthetic purposes as being useless as far as the mass of the people and their needs are concerned. As with libraries and museums, so with these more distinctively artistic works; these perform their great use when they reach the best of the masses of the people. It is worth more to reach and touch the sentiment for beauty in the naturally bright minds of this class than that those incapable of being so touched should be pandered to. For what the improver of the race must endeavor to do is to reach those who have the divine spark ever so feebly developed, that it may be strengthened and grow. For my part, I think Mr. Phipps put his money to better use in giving the workingmen of Allegheny conservatories filled with beautiful flowers, orchids, and aquatic plants, which they, with their wives and children, can enjoy in their spare hours, and on which they can feed the love for the beautiful, than if he had given his surplus money to furnish them with bread, for those in health who cannot earn their bread are scarcely worth considering by the individual giver; the care of such being the duty of the state. The man who erects in a city a truly artistic arch, statue, or fountain makes a wise use of his surplus. "Man does not live by bread alone."

Fifth—We have another good use for surplus wealth, in providing for our cities halls suitable for meetings of all kinds, especially for concerts of elevating music. Our cities are rarely provided with halls for these purposes, being in this respect also very far behind European cities. The Springer Hall, of Cincinnati, that valuable addition to the city, was largely the gift of Mr. Springer, who was not content to bequeath funds from his estate at death, but who gave during his life, and, in addition, gave—what was equally important—his time and business ability to insure the successful results which have been achieved. The gift of a hall to any city lacking one is an excellent use for surplus wealth for the good of a community. The reason

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

why the people have only one instructive and elevating, or even amusing, entertainment when a dozen would be highly beneficial, is that the rent of a hall, even when a suitable hall exists (which is rare), is so great as to prevent managers from running the risk of financial failure. If every city in our land owned a hall which could be given or rented for a small sum for such gatherings as a committee or the mayor of the city judged advantageous, the people could be furnished with proper lectures, amusements, and concerts at an exceedingly small cost. The town halls of European cities, many of which have organs, are of inestimable value to the people, when utilized as they are in the manner suggested. Let no one underrate the influence of entertainments of an elevating or even of an amusing character, for these do much to make the lives of the people happier and their natures better. If any millionaire born in a small village, which has now become a great city, is prompted in the day of his success to do something for his birthplace with part of his surplus, his grateful remembrance cannot take a form more useful than that of a public hall with an organ, provided the city agrees to maintain and use it.

Sixth—In another respect we are still much behind Europe. A form of beneficence which is not uncommon there is providing swimming baths for the people. The donors of these have been wise enough to require the city benefited to maintain them at its own expense, and as proof of the contention that everything should never be done for any one or for any community, but that the recipients should invariably be called upon to do part, it is significant that it is found essential for the popular success of these healthful establishments to exact a nominal charge for their use. In many cities, however, the school children are admitted free at fixed hours upon certain days, different hours being fixed for the boys and the girls to use the great swimming baths, hours or days being also fixed for the use of these baths by ladies. In inland cities the young of both sexes are thus taught to swim. Swimming clubs are organized, and matches are frequent, at which medals and prizes are given. The reports published by the various swimming baths throughout Great Britain are filled with instances of lives saved because those who fortunately escaped shipwreck had been taught to swim in the baths, and not a few instances are given in which the pupils of certain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bathing establishments have saved the lives of others. If any disciple of the "Gospel of Wealth" gives his favorite city large swimming and private baths (provided the municipality undertakes their management as a city affair), he will never be called to account for an improper use of the funds intrusted to him.

Seventh—Churches as fields for the use of surplus wealth have purposely been reserved until the last, because, these being sectarian, every man will be governed by his own attachments; therefore gifts to churches, it may be said, are not, in one sense, gifts to the community at large, but to special classes. Nevertheless, every millionaire may know of a district where the little cheap, uncomfortable, and altogether unworthy wooden structure stands at the crossroads, to which the whole neighborhood gathers on Sunday, and which is the centre of social life and source of neighborly feeling. The administrator of wealth has made a good use of part of his surplus if he replaces that building with a permanent structure of brick, stone, or granite, up the sides of which the honeysuckle and columbine may climb, and from whose tower the sweet-tolling bell may sound. The millionaire should not figure how cheaply this structure can be built, but how perfect it can be made. If he has the money, it should be made a gem, for the educating influence of a pure and noble specimen of architecture, built, as the pyramids were built, to stand for ages, is not to be measured by dollars. Every farmer's home, heart, and mind in the district will be influenced by the beauty and grandeur of the church. But having given the building, the donor should stop there; the support of the church should be upon its own people; there is not much genuine religion in the congregation or much good to flow from the church which is not supported at home.

Many other avenues for the wise expenditure of surplus wealth might be indicated. I enumerate but a few—a very few—of the many fields which are open, and only those in which great or considerable sums can be judiciously used. It is not the privilege, however, of millionaires alone to work for or aid measures which are certain to benefit the community. Every one who has but a small surplus above his moderate wants may share this privilege with his richer brothers, and those without surplus can give at least part of their time, which is usually as important as funds, and often more so. Some day, perhaps, with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

your permission, I will endeavor to point out some fields and modes in which these may perform well their part as trustees of wealth or leisure, according to the measure of their respective fortunes.

It is not expected, neither is it desirable, that there should be a general concurrence as to the best possible use of surplus wealth. For different men and different localities there are different uses. What commends itself most highly to the judgment of the administrator is the best use for him, for his heart should be in the work. It is as important in administering wealth as it is in any other branch of a man's work that he should be enthusiastically devoted to it and feel that in the field selected his work lies.

Besides this, there is room and need for all kinds of wise benefactions for the common weal. The man who builds a university, library, or laboratory performs no more useful work than he who elects to devote himself and his surplus means to the adornment of a park, the gathering together of a collection of pictures for the public, or the building of a memorial arch. These are all true laborers in the vineyard. The only point required by the "Gospel of Wealth" is that the surplus which accrues from time to time in the hands of a man should be administered by him in his own lifetime for that purpose which is seen by him, as trustee, to be best for the good of the people. To leave at death what he cannot take away, and place upon others the burden of the work which it was his own duty to perform, is to do nothing worthy. This requires no sacrifice, nor any sense of duty to his fellows.

Time was when the words concerning the rich man entering heaven were regarded as a hard saying. To-day, when all questions are probed to the bottom and the standards of faith receive the most liberal interpretations, the startling verse has been relegated to the rear, to await the next kindly revision as one of those things which cannot be quite understood, but which meanwhile—it is carefully to be observed—are not to be understood literally. But is it so very improbable that the next stage of thought is not to restore the doctrine in all its pristine purity and force, as being in perfect harmony with sound ideas upon the subject of wealth and poverty, the rich and the poor, and the contrasts everywhere seen and deplored? In Christ's day, it is evident, reformers were against the wealthy. It is none the less

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evident that we are fast recurring to that position to-day; and there will be nothing to surprise the student of sociological development if society should soon approve the text which has caused so much anxiety: "It is easier for a camel to enter the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven." Even if the needle were the small casement at the gates, the words betoken serious difficulty for the rich. It will be but a step for the theologian to take from the doctrine that he who dies rich dies disgraced to that which brings upon the man punishment or deprivation hereafter.

The "Gospel of Wealth" but echoes Christ's words. It calls upon the millionaire to sell all that he hath and give it in the highest and best form to the poor, by administering his estate himself for the good of his fellows, before he is called upon to lie down and rest upon the bosom of Mother Earth. So doing, he will approach his end no longer the ignoble hoarder of useless millions, poor, very poor indeed, in money, but rich, very rich, twenty times a millionaire still, in the affection, gratitude, and admiration of his fellow-men, and—sweeter far—soothed and sustained by the still small voice within, which, whispering, tells him that, because he has lived, perhaps one small part of the great world has been bettered just a little. This much is sure: against such riches as these no bar will be found at the Gates of Paradise.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMAN OPERA AND EVERY-DAY LIFE.

BY WALTER DAMROSCH.

FIVE years ago the German opera was founded by Dr. Leopold Damrosch at the Metropolitan Opera-House, in New York, and these five years have witnessed one of the most remarkable phenomena in the art-history of America. A people descended from all the nationalities of the globe, with no mythological past of their own, have received with enthusiasm and growing appreciation a series of musical dramas by Richard Wagner, based on the old German mythology, played in a world absolutely foreign to their own, and governed by certain art-laws which revolutionized all preconceived ideas on this subject. It seems remarkable that it should be possible for a people occupied almost exclusively with material things to understand a world so unreal and ideal as this; to appreciate a work based on the mythology of a past age,—as if they, too, had heard the tales of the Edda in childhood, and had grown up among the remains of a past which stretches into the dim prehistoric ages.

It is interesting to look for the causes that led to this artistic awakening of our people. These are not far to seek.

Wagner, perhaps the greatest universal genius since Shakespeare, has given his works a translation which should make them intelligible to all. There is one universal language, and that is music, for as an art it has no nationality. Its germs, the folk-song and dance, are national, but its developments take it out of the narrow limitations of race or geography, and in its highest forms, its purest manifestations, it speaks and belongs to all the world.

Realizing this great power, and developing its possibilities in this direction to a hitherto unheard-of extent, Wagner translated every character on the stage, every emotion, the dramatic ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, even the great symbolic ideas underlying his poems, by a music composed of a series of most characteristic phrases or motives. This system was but the natural result of his constant striving for dramatic truth, and his works show the gradual evolution of this idea. Already in the "Flying Dutchman" do we find a musical motive expressive of the central character of the opera, but the full development of the system was reached in the "Nibelungen Trilogy," where motive is joined to motive, developed with marvellous artistic skill, forming a musical current rolling along in the orchestra, and accompanying and amplifying every word as the drama progresses.

Americans were quick to appreciate all this. Here was something tangible, something that appealed to the intellect as well as to the imagination, and even before the names and significance of these motives were fully understood, the mind half-unconsciously associated certain actions on the stage with certain harmonies or melodies which accompanied them. Through the musical interpretation, the various vague and mystic characters of the old Sagas are made to stand clearly before us. Their characterization is complete and intelligible to all, and more clearly than ever before do we feel the great power of music to disclose to us subtle and delicate shades of meaning, which words alone could never hope to express.

Such a union of words and music, such a completion of one by the other, could only have been acomplished where both poet and musician were combined in one, as in Wagner, for even as he wrote the words of his dramas, their musical significance and expression were almost simultaneously created, and the writing of them down became simply a mechanical act.

Wagner loved to choose the subjects for his dramas from the old mythologies and legends of the people, because in these their strivings and ideals found form with greater clearness and naïve simplicity than in any actual historical event. The emotions and passions displayed in the earliest myths are common to all the world, but as the centuries rolled by their characters became encrusted with local additions, and, from general human types, were narrowed down to national characters. In many instances different versions, as developed by different nations, existed, and it was only by divesting them of these local additions and mere externals that Wagner brought out and gave to us the original elements, the mother-types which con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tain the germs of all human emotions within them. And these must appeal to us all, for no matter how far from the mother-race we may have wandered, there is something in these grand old heroic types of men and women which speaks to us as some half-forgotten song of our childhood, as something that we, too, once possessed and called ours. They are far removed from the conventionalities of the "modern," and the symbolisms in which they are clothed are for all times and all men.

Wagner touches on this in his essay, "Eine Mittheilung an meine Freunde," as follows:

"Since my return from Paris to Germany I had made the German past ages my favorite study. I have mentioned before the deep longing for my country which filled me at that time. This country in its present reality could not requite my longings in any way, and I felt that a deeper yearning must be at the bottom of my desires, which found nourishment in another than the mere longing for my *modern* home. As if to sound its depths, I penetrated down to the original home element (*das urheimische Element*) that appears to us in the poetry of the past, which draws us nearer and closer, as the present with inimical coldness rejects us. All our wishes and burning desires, which in reality carry us into the *future*, we seek to realize from the pictures of the *past*, in order to create a form for them which the modern *present* cannot give.

"In the effort to give artistic form to the wishes of my heart, and in the desire to learn what it was that drew me so unresistingly to the fount of the old Sagas, I arrived step by step into the realm of the remote past, where, to my great joy, and even there, in the *remotest* past, I found at last the youthfully beautiful *man* in the pristine freshness of his strength,

"My studies thus carried me through the poems of the mediæval ages back to the beginning of the old German mythology; one garment after the other, that the later versions had thrown about him, I succeeded in taking off, to behold him at last in his purest beauty. What I here saw was no longer the historic, conventional figure, on which the garment must interest us more than the person; but the real naked *man*, on whom I could perceive every throbbing of the heart, every play of the strong muscles, in untrammelled freest motion; in short, the *true man*. . . . If the glorious figure of *Siegfried* had already attracted me for a long time, it really only began to enthuse me when I had succeeded in freeing it from later additions, and seeing it before me in its purest human form. Only now did I recognize the possibility of making him the hero of a drama, which never occurred to me, as long as I knew him solely from the mediæval *Nibelungen-lied*."

Although Americans, as a race, are young, the veneration for the immediate past, the childhood of its people, existed already in a marked degree. Old family histories, miniatures, and heirlooms are preserved with religious veneration, and many an American is proud to be able to trace the birth of his family to some little spot in old Europe, glad that he, too, is connected with the past, although his work is to conquer the new. But of the prehistoric past, the mythology of the people from whom he is descended, the American knew little or nothing. He was not in touch with it, and, at best, its characters were but so many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

curious and perhaps interesting figures of a world with which he had nothing in common.

It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, for him to assimilate the spirit of the Norse Sagas and legendary lore, but music, that great universalist, spoke, and translated them for him in a language which he, too, can understand; and thus the miracle has been accomplished, and *Siegfried* and *Brunhilde*, *Lohengrin* and *Tanhäuser*, belong to-day as much to the musical people of America as to Germany.

It is interesting to note that, of the many musical motives employed by Wagner in the "Nibelungen Trilogy," those descriptive or symbolic of the elements of nature found their way first to the understanding of our people. They appreciated at once the grand portrayal of water, the mighty element, in the introduction to "Rhinegold," the remarkable development of the Water Motive on one and the same chord surging on ward and upward in constant and increasing motion; also the motive of "*Loki*," the element of fire, the scheming, deceitful god. They were quick to perceive its symbolic character, its chromatic figures seeming to dart hither and thither in restless activity, like so many tongues of flickering flame, and then again the steady glow, so wonderfully expressed in the orchestra, as *Wotan* binds this restless element to burn in a circle of fire around the sleeping *Brunhilde*. At the first performance of this scene at the Metropolitan Opera-House the audience were aroused to a wild pitch of enthusiasm which has since been equalled only by other performances of the same master's works. A strange and interesting fact in this connection is the enthusiastic reception which the "Ride of the Valkyries" received in *concert* performances before it was ever given in connection with a dramatic performance. So great is the descriptive power of music in this that it pictured to our imagination, without the help of a scenic background or stage performance, the glorious *Valkyries* as they ride through the air, bearing the slain heroes to *Walhall*. The unbridled freedom and trembling excitement, the elemental force of the music, were appreciated by none sooner than by Americans. How our nerves tingle and our hearts beat, as the first rush of the Ride Motive comes to our ears, and what a stupendous climax is reached when the *Valkyries'* Battle Motive breaks forth in its rude strength and rhythmic daring. We hear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the whinnying of the horses, the battle-cry of the great war-maidens, and above all the thunderous hoofbeat of the gigantic wild chargers as they rush through the clouds. The picture thus conveyed to our mind is complete, and far more perfect than scenic art or stage machinery can as yet accomplish.

Americans are great lovers of nature, but perhaps never before had the poetry of the forest been brought so near to them as in the second act of "Siegfried," where the sacred quiet of the forest, the rustling of the leaves, the flickering sunlight as it filters through them, throwing its bright patches on the green moss, the chirping of the birds, the hum of insects, are all reproduced in a music which defies description, but which speaks with a directness and truth, a fidelity to the most delicate phases of poetry in nature, that must appeal to all. The whole scene forms a fitting background to the boy *Siegfried,* who, outstretched beneath the wide-branching linden-tree, gives vent to his longing for a being like himself; for this child of the forest has seen that all the beasts, the birds, and the fishes find mates, and only he is all alone, an ugly dwarf his sole companion.

These portrayals of nature, as well as the motives expressive of the fundamental passions or emotions, were the first to be felt by our audience; but gradually the more symbolic motives and their deeper meanings were appreciated as they became more and more familiar—the motive of the "Curse on the Ring," with its grating dissonances, the sharp-cutting, flashing Sword Motive, symbolic of the heroic race created by *Wotan,* and from these to the motives of *Siegfried,* the boy, with its merry hunting fanfare, and *Siegfried,* the man, with its more sustained, heroic character, down to *Siegfried's* death and the accompanying funeral music, which gives us in grand succession the whole tragic history of the *Volsungen race*—a veritable funeral oration in music.

At the first performance of the "Götterdämmerung" in New York, the opinion was quite generally expressed that Wagner had here reached his greatest musical and dramatic climax, and that the drama should have ended here; but gradually the still higher climax revealed by him in the end of the last act dawned upon the audience, as the significance of the "Atonement through Love" Motive, the most exalted of all, became apparent, for it is through *Brunhilde's* self-sacrifice that the curse is lifted from the ring and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world; and with this idea the trilogy ends, the deeply symbolic motive foreshadowing the Christian religion—the idea of self-sacrifice through love. Many among the audience realized perhaps for the first time the close connection which always must exist, directly or indirectly, between art and religion—that the two are inseparable, serving the same purpose and striving for the same ends.

The interest among musical people to learn more about these wonderful creations and their deeper symbolic significance became intense. The performances in New York and other cities were crowded from pit to dome, and the better acquainted the people became with the music, the greater became their enthusiasm. The frivolity which characterized the behavior of a portion of our people during the period when a "amusement operas" were principally performed at our opera-houses grew less and less with the founding of the German opera, and finally ceased altogether as the idea gained ground that music and the drama had also other purposes than the mere amusement of an idle hour, and that even on weekdays some time could be spent with nobler things in a building formerly considered to exist only as a gathering-place for the idle world.

All this means more than a mere craze or fashion; it means an awakening of the masses to the ideal, to things beyond the material, which nothing else had been able to accomplish to such a degree before. Wagner has drawn the people into his magic circle, and even the unmusical are beginning to see the possibilities of music as a refining and chastening influence over our emotions. With its help he has given to Americans the past. It is theirs to hold and to keep, if they will but stretch out their hands for this rich treasure; for this is necessary to the development of an artistic spirit in our race. Art cannot live on the present, which is ever too much entangled with the material, and the conventionalities of life, but must draw its sustenance from the remote past, where our imagination, our poetic spirit, can be kindled, and we can behold the heroic type as developed in all its original strength in the mythology of the people. True art should spring from the people and speak to the people. It can never take a firm foothold as long as it remains a luxury instead of becoming a necessity. Wagner has done much to show us the way from the material to the ideal, where our spirit can find refuge and sustenance. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had almost become strangled under the universal greed for the material; the "*Curse of the Gold*" was upon it, and it needed such a popular uprising as was produced by the "Nibelungen Trilogy" to prove that it was not dead, and that a little care and nursing would bring it to healthful life and strength. Much has been done, but more remains. It was natural that American women should have preceded the sterner sex in the development of the artistic temperament. Their greater freedom from the material spirit of the country, and the exalted position accorded them by men,—far above that of the women of any other country,—gave them opportunities for the development of heart and mind of which they availed themselves to the fullest extent.

The time is not far distant when it was thought unadvisable to teach boys anything of music for fear that it might take their minds too much from business interests, and it is only lately that a healthy reaction has set in and they, too, are permitted to learn what will prove to them in after years the greatest rest and relaxation from the prose of every-day affairs. That this reaction is due to a great extent to the influence of American mothers there can be no doubt, and now that a more even artistic development is going on among both sexes greater results may be expected from the future. The children of to-day are the men and women of to-morrow. Let their imagination be kindled by the old fairy tales, and as they grow older let them read the stories of the heroes of the Greek and Norse mythologies, told in a simple way that they can understand. And, above all, let music, and only good music, be around and about them always. The days of the hard prose of life come soon enough; and they will be better able to meet and conquer these if they have the memory of a poetic childhood to strengthen and to sustain them. Let the church also examine with more interest the possibilities of art as a factor in religion, although not of sectarianism. While some ministers are enthusiastic devotees of music, a great majority have but vague ideas on the subject, many having labored under the great disadvantage of not having had proper opportunities for self-development. Good musicians are scarce in this country, if we take into consideration its enormous area and its 65,000,000 of people. Cities like New York and Boston are already well supplied, but fifty good leaders could be placed to advantage in fifty differ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ent cities of the Union. The signs are auspicious. Never was there such an awakening to art; never such a grand field for musicians to work in. There is room for all who may come, and as the country is as yet too young to supply all its needs in this repect, let us welcome gladly all foreign musicians who come to these shores to assist in our country's development.

The next great musical genius of the world should be an American; but he can only come after generations of musicians have prepared our soil and sown the seed which, under the warmth of his sacred fire, shall ripen to a rich harvest.

WALTER DAMROSCH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INCAPACITY OF BUSINESS WOMEN.

BY MARION HARLAND.

IN THIS article it will be taken for granted that men conduct all branches of what is known as business—manufacturing, mercantile, professional, and even educational—more systematically and successfully than women. Such shining exceptions as arise in the mind of every reader who is inclined to doubt the premises make the surrounding gloom more apparent.

She who refuses to recognize the truth is a short-sighted champion of her sex. She who, perceiving the justice of the censure, throws the blame of the present state of affairs upon tyrant man, and exhorts an oppressed class to rebellion that shall reverse the position of governed and governors, offers an intoxicating draught instead of a remedy.

During the war in the Sudan, a young British officer in charge of the signal service, posted for the time upon the top of the Great Pyramid, was so uplifted by historic associations and Napoleonic example as to telegraph to the admiral's ship, just arrived in the nearest offing: "*Forty centuries salute you!*" The martinet superior signalled back: "None of your [expletive] nonsense! Attend to business!"

This somewhat profane anecdote illustrates what I shall offer as the fundamental cause of the unfitness of the average woman for business pursuits. Not forty, but sixty, centuries of PRECEDENT handicap her who would earn her bread after the manner of men, without fear of social ostracism and without favor offered as a gallant gratuity. From the time of her foremother Eve until now, hers has been unsalaried labor. Two centuries of the same system of desultory tasks, done for board and clothing, sufficed to make thriftless pensioners of the colored race. He who has never known for himself the duties and responsibilities of ownership is, notoriously, a bad guardian of others' property.

The Indian dervish whose arm, upshot in prayer, is held thus,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

week by week, until he cannot lower it, is not an inapt figure of the modern woman. She has had her "keep," and pocket-money for the asking—quantity and quality depending upon the manner of petition, her lord's humor, or her personal attractions—for unnumbered generations. To expect from her stiffened muscles such action as he displays whose moral and mental brawn has been developed by the steady exercise of centuries is cruelly preposterous.

Leaving general propositions for particular intances, we will take a department of honest toil where, it is affirmed, women compete most successfully with men—that of the sales-clerk, especially in dry-goods, fancy, and millinery shops. The sternest master virtually admits the comparative incompetency of his feminine employees in other ways, as well as in wages. The laxity of discipline among them is manifest to the least observant. The "sales-lady" who waits upon me may be supercilious to the verge of impertinence, slow, and inattentive; she may hum a tune while listlessly displaying the wares she is paid to exhibit to advantage, and carry on lively, if intermittent, gossip or altercation with her mates, while I am—in spite of her—conducting my purchases,—and all in sight and hearing of the floor-walker who would arraign a salesman for any one of these offences against common courtesy. The feminine peculiarities of levity, wandering eyes and thoughts, misnamed "vivacity," and the quality we term in colts and kittens "skittishness," are so well known to every overlooker of women clerks, operatives, and teachers as to purchase indulgence, unconsciously exercised and ungratefully received. Moreover, these idiosyncrasies, seldom catalogued as faults, *keep wages down.*

The office-boy is ruled up sharply by line and plummet, not only as to work, but deportment. He must be punctual, move quickly and quietly, leave all thought of frolic and out-door companionships behind when he crosses the threshold of his place of business; he must be prompt and respectful in speech to employers, and civil to customer, client, and caller—or he goes! The girl stenographer and typewriter "giggles and makes giggle" with the girl book-keeper, and has tiffs (audible) with her enemy, the "old-maid" cashier. One and all, when reproved for negligence, breach of rules, or inefficiency, they retort, or sulk, or—most likely—snivel! In no one respect is precedent more potent than in this matter of women's tears. The briny drip is the most powerful solvent known to science or sentimentalist. I have in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

memory the true story of one "lady" manager of an important department, who kept her place long after her unfitness was acknowledged by the firm, because of a proclivity to hysterics. Every man in the establishment, married or celibate, shrank from the task of discharging her. The information that she must seek another position was finally conveyed in a letter, enclosing a *placebo* in the form of a check, written and sent to her by a partner on the eve of sailing for Europe.

Such straws show the trend of the popular estimate of women's unfitness for business pursuits. It is as natural for a man to avoid "scenes" as for women to get them up. Some of the latter trade, wittingly, upon feeling, calculating cunningly upon the proverbial effect of lachrymal demonstration. The majority do not. Precedent, which they mistake for Nature and one of Heaven's laws, decrees that they must be treated according to a certain set of rules—men according to another and a different.

Here lies the defective spot in the claim for equitable wages for working women. Physical disability apart, *they do not work as men do.* A man grasps his business with both hands. If his hands are not strong enough, he clamps it with his feet, and, rather than let it go, seizes it with his jaws. It is his life—himself! A woman, even when the daily bread of herself and her children depends upon a clerkship, or employment in a factory, or the teacher's place in a public school, regards her labor as the means to an end. It is the ladder reared against the height she would win. A man's chosen craft or profession is the central stone staircase, built into the solid structure. Men work by the job, concentrating every energy upon the task of perfecting that which must pass or be rejected upon its own merit. Women go out by the day—and watch the clock! Men have ambitions; women have hopes.

The reasons assigned for these radical differences are led off in most essays on the subject, and pertinently, by the fact that women look forward to marriage as a definite means of support, and hold but loosely that which they may be called upon at any moment to give up. With an immense proportion of the sex this explanation more than covers the ground. It does not account for the perfunctory manner in which the deserted wife or faithful widow walks through what she makes to be the tread-mill of daily toil. She considers the necessity of self-support as violence done to Nature and PRECEDENT. Always *that!* The contestants

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for equal rights and equitable compensation must dethrone this idol before women can become self-supporting. The work which is not honored of the laborer will never honor her.

I had occasion once to call in the services of a trained nurse for a member of my family. While the child remained extremely ill, the attendant was all that could be desired for skill, fidelity, and modest dignity of deportment. The crisis passed and convalescence assured, precedent came to the front. The nurse discoursed to the patient by the hour upon the hard lot that had obliged her to earn her living; enumerated the handsome gowns, silver, and other valuables that had been hers in her former estate; unfolded to me her pedigree of gentlemen and gentlewomen for four generations, and dropped tears upon the bread she toasted while asserting to the kitchen-cabinet her right to be treated as a "real lady, although unfortunate."

Another sick-nurse, an otherwise sensible woman of forty-odd years, carried about with her always a roll of MS. penned by her late husband, a drunken penny-a-liner, whose one kindness to her was done in dying. "Ah! if he had lived to get his book printed, I'd never have been taking care of sick people for twenty dollars a week and my board!" was her lament. Being a woman, with sixty centuries of women like herself behind her, she never suspected how much more honorably lucrative was her present position than that of the half-starved and maltreated slave of a human brute.

A week ago I was detained by a shower in a fancy store, and dropped into chat with the sad-faced mistress of the neat establishment. A chance comment from me upon the ways of the professional "shopper" led to the usual thing. She "never thought in the days when she lived in her own brownstone front, and kept her carriage, that she would ever be reduced to *this*," etc., etc.

The small merchant (masculine) who should descend to such maundering with a passing stranger would stamp himself as one who deserved to be unsuccessful in any station of life. Until reduced gentlewomen leave their breeding to speak for itself, and, instead of making drafts upon the sympathy of the community because the trade-harness galls their tender shoulders, bear it so gallantly as to enforce respect from those who only see how well they do that which they have chosen—not reluctantly accepted—they cannot complain that their own estimate of their position is assumed as just by people at large.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The dressmaker who goes out by the day, and so hotly resents the indignity of a napkined tray laden with a tempting lunch sent up to the sewing-room that she quits the house and throws up a profitable engagement, is unbusiness-like, and also illogically foolish. She is neither one of the family nor an invited guest. The circumstance of eating from the same board with her employers, with whom she has nothing in common except that they pay her ample wages for making their clothes, lowers, not raises, her in the social scale. The same may be said of the saleswoman who "takes her time," obviously and offensively, in measuring ribbon and making change, to impress an impatient customer, who has to catch a train, with the idea that she is "as good as anybody else and not to be ordered around like a hireling."

These are not cited as unimportant weaknesses to be smiled at, or, at most, despised. They represent sentiments and motives which seriously hinder the working-woman from rendering herself free and independent. She must make labor, and the drawbacks and trials incident to labor, an impersonal matter, and relegate feeling to the sacred domain of the inner life, if she would command success. The moment she takes advantage of the accident of her sex and appeals to sentimentality, instead of justice, she begs the question, and sinks toward pauperism.

Closely contingent upon this fashion of looking backward, and not forward, is the spiritless performance of duties inseparable from the contemned office. It cannot be otherwise. Action, in such a case, is but stony-ground grain, and only kept from withering out of sight by the irrigation of wages.

What, then, is needed to raise up for this generation a class of business women who will dignify their sex and quell the clamor of the prisoners of poverty? First, last, and always, *to undertake the allotted labor with the forceful purpose of performing it as if it were the one and only object in life.*

An editorial writer in the *Christian Union* said lately in a talk with "Business Boys": "The boy who will succeed in the world is he who is content, for a time, to do two dollars' worth of work for a dollar." Business girls need to bind this precept upon heart and hand. Determination to fulfil every obligation thoroughly, in spirit and in letter, should outrank the thought of the money to be made by this particular undertaking. First, excellence of workmanship; then, what price will it command? The girl who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

studies book-keeping or stenography as a stop-gap against the tide of impecuniosity until she can wed a bread-and-bonnet-winner, enacts the trite role of the little Haarlem hero with his thumb in the dike leak. She is like one who watches for the morning, and, in proportion as her heart fails at the delay of dawn, interest in her occupation declines. Judging by her standard of values the business laid importunately to her hand and the wedlock that *may* come, we may well remind her that faithfulness in that which is least is the earnest of faithfulness in that which is great. The steadfast industry, the discipline of speech and conduct, the concentration of thought and energy upon the matter set before one for accomplishment, that are essential to business prosperity, are the best conceivable preparation for the high and holy sphere of wife, housekeeper, and mother.

It is more sadly true that the home in which the wife is denied all knowledge of business methods and principles is the worst possible school for the duties which may, which often do, devolve upon a widow. Why practical, long-headed husbands and fathers regard complacently the inability of wives and daughters to audit tradesmen's bills and keep their own personal accounts, is an anomaly of human nature and conduct that usually goes unrebuked. To pursue this system until to full-grown babies and an equally inefficient mother is committed the management of all that stands between them and want, is like demanding from a jelly-fish, left high by the tide, the hardy pugnacity of a warrior-crab.

With the exit of Lydia Languish and Laura Matilda from the stage of every-day life has come the need for better stuff to meet the demands of an age that is terribly in earnest. Fortunes are not now salted down in three-per-cent. consols and other government securities, to await the possible exigencies of wife and children. The more luxurious our girl's home to-day, the likelier she is to be to-morrow among those whose call (I quote from a letter upon my desk) for "work which a woman who was educated to do nothing in particular can handle" comes to the ear of the lover of her sex like the wail of unbaptized babies wandering in the outer darkness. We pity the petitioners; but can we forgive the mistaken fondness that hears in the lamentable cry no warning demand for business education for women?

MARION HARLAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

VII.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K.P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

THE situation, however discouraging to the North it was for the moment, was soon now about to change. The siege was about to begin that was eventually to entail the fall of the Confederate capital and the capture of Lee's devoted army. By the end of June, 1864, it is not surprising that much pressure was brought to bear upon President Lincoln to remove Grant and, somewhat later, to stop General Sherman's southward movement. It was then that Mr. Lincoln's historic phrase, that he would not "swop horses whilst crossing a stream," settled the policy of the Federal Government. It decided the fate of the war.

If for the moment we turn our attention from the Army of the Potomac to the campaign of General Sherman against General Joseph E. Johnston, we there find plenty of very interesting and instructive matter. It is difficult to believe that the army of which General Johnston assumed command when the campaign began could have been altogether in the splendid condition at that period which is attributed to it by General Hood. It was the same army which had been disastrously defeated by Grant at Chattanooga, and since that event no circumstances had occurred which could have tended to restore its *morale*, heavily shaken as it was by that disaster. There may or may not have been some errors of detail in the disposition of the army for the defence of Rocky-face Mountain, but with forces so superior to him as those of Sherman's were at this period, it is difficult to see how Johnston could have adopted any other rôle than the defensive one he actually assumed. According to the careful cal-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culation of Major Dawes (page 281), his own army stood to Sherman's as 64 to 100 in point of numbers, but certainly in every respect inferior in point of equipment, and more especially in the supply of ammunition. His own estimate, which puts the figures as low as 4 to 10, though it is probably too low, marks, no doubt, his opinion, at the time, of the fighting powers of the two armies. It is not quite fair (as Major Dawes seems to do) to reckon up the casual replacements and reënforcements which reach a general during a campaign as, necessarily, additions to his original strength. The total number of men "to be accounted for" as "available for battle," given by Major Dawes as 84,328, leaves an entirely false impression on the ordinary reader, as though it meant that General Johnston had at some one moment an army of that size under his orders. As regarded his day-to-day fighting strength, he was very much in the position of the man who, with a very inadequate income, should receive small sums of capital at different times which he had to treat as income. In the aggregate those small sums might possibly reach a considerable amount, and if he had received them altogether and early in life, he might have lived handsomely upon the interest. But, as it was, his necessities obliged him to use up from time to time those sums for which critical friends said afterwards he should "account." Without, therefore, attempting to decide too positively between the estimates of General Johnston and of Major Dawes as to the available strength of the Confederate Army, I think it may safely be assumed that the fighting force of General Johnston's army was such that, for the time at least, a defensive and watching position was enforced on him.

It is difficult for a stranger to discuss the character of a country regarding which one of the two opposing generals who fought over it says:

"Mr. Davis and General Sherman exhibit a strange ignorance of the country between Dalton and Atlanta. Mr. Davis describes mountain ridges offering positions neither to be taken nor turned, and a natural fortress eighteen miles in extent, forgetting, apparently, that a fortress is strong only when it has a garrison strong enough for its extent; and both forget that, except Rocky-face, *no mountain is visible from the road between Dalton and Atlanta.*"

Yet in the middle of this very paper we have a picture of the Confederates dragging guns up "Kenesaw Mountain," which certainly conveys the impression that the "mountain" was at least a very steep and considerable hill. According to the map which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faces page 250, "Kenesaw Mountain" looks as if it ought to be pretty clearly visible from the road in question. The whole map indicates a series of ridges which appear to be mountainous. The word "mountain" is also scattered over it almost as thickly as peas in a pod. The words "Chattoogata Mountains," "Horn Mountains," "Pine Mountain," "Carnes Mountain," "Lost Mountain," etc., leave one in utter bewilderment between the meaning of General Johnston's expression and the meaning of the term "mountain" as locally used in those parts. One is obliged, therefore, to follow the campaign at some disadvantage in these respects. However, allowing for all differences as to the views of the writers and map-makers as to what is and is not a mountain, it seems tolerably clear that General Sherman successfully manœuvred Johnston out of his first positions at Dalton. They were not, however, positions which Johnston had any intention to hold seriously, for he very naturally considered them as too extensive for the force under his command.

The one opportunity for striking an offensive blow which presented itself to Johnston occurred at Cassville, and he took every step that was possible to him in order to take advantage of it. Either owing to some misunderstanding on General Hood's part or from some other cause not explained, Johnston's orders were not carried out, but the opportunity was lost through no fault on the part of General Johnston. No other presented itself up to the moment when he was deprived of his command, at which time he was busily engaged in preparing to take advantage of a temporary separation of General Sherman's army into two parts. The defects in execution which attended General Hood's attempt to strike this very blow, which had been suggested to him by Johnston, would have been much less likely to occur had Johnston remained in command. It was for the Confederates a fatal illustration of the danger of "swopping horses," either when you are "crossing a stream" in the figurative sense, or when your enemy is actually crossing a stream and you lose the chance to attack him. It does not seem from these pages that General Johnston can be fairly charged with any undue preference for a purely defensive course of action. In command of an inferior army, he wisely waited on the defensive, watching for time and opportunity to strike back at his skilful adversary. It was the faults of others and the impatience of the Confederate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government which snatched from his grasp the chances that were presented to him.

In this history he appears simply as the Fabius of the war, whereas he was, in fact, only pursuing a Fabian policy at a time when it was the sole course open to him to avoid certain defeat. Always on the lookout for an opportunity to assume the offensive, he seems to have been always anxious to act in a very different manner from what he did, had circumstances favored his doing so. There are, however, some very interesting points which arise out of the events of this campaign, especially as to the effect which operations like those carried out by Johnston are likely to have upon the fighting value of an army. Many of the ideas and reasons which influenced his action could not have been known to his troops,—a condition of things which from the earliest ages has often turned soldiers against their commander. There has been, unfortunately, so much angry discussion over the events of this campaign, and so many contradictory statements as to fact and so many private reputations are involved, that it is peculiarly difficult to arrive at the truth. In attempting, therefore, to state the case as it is given in *The Century* papers, the military student is obliged to trust very much to his own judgment in the rejection or acceptance of the conflicting statements. One is naturally prejudiced in favor of those which appear to fit in best with the story as a whole and those which are most in accordance with the general experiences of war.

The first question that naturally arises is, What was the state of the Confederate Army when Johnston handed over the command to General Hood? The conclusion to be drawn as to the practical success or failure of Johnston's strategy up to that period will be very much influenced by the answer given to that question. As far as one can judge of the facts from the evidence we derive from General Sherman's own account, together with that supplied by General Johnston and in the main by others, it is that a most difficult task had been set before the Federal Army. It seems abundantly clear that, as long as General Johnston commanded against it, very little success that was of much value had been achieved. But, on the other hand, it is difficult not to attach some importance to the plea put forward by General Hood that the desertions from the Confederate Army had reached a most alarming figure, in consequence of General Johnston's con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinued retreat. His war of intrenchments, one line made after another, and always further and further to the rear, though it was terribly annoying to the Federal general, had, it was said, told seriously on the *morale* of the Southern troops.

It seems clear that, if the campaign were to be looked upon merely as a great game of chessmen, Sherman, by his long advance from Chattanooga to Atlanta, had rather weakened than strengthened his position. He seems to admit as much himself when he says: "Johnston had meantime picked up his detachments, and had received reënforcements from his rear which raised his aggregate strength to 62,000 men, and warranted him in claiming that he was purposely drawing us far from our base, and that when the right moment should come he would turn on us and destroy us." (Page 252.) And again: "No officer or soldier who ever served under me will question the generalship of Joseph E. Johnston. His retreats were timely, in good order, and he left nothing behind." (Page 253.) Of course he says also, as any good soldier would, "We were equally confident, and not the least alarmed." (Page 252.) But there is no mistaking the meaning of the sentence, "At this critical moment the Confederate Government rendered us most valuable service. Being dissatisfied with the Fabian policy of General Johnston, it relieved him, and General Hood was substituted to command the Confederate Army." That clearly represents the view of a most able and generous opponent as to the management of the Army of Tennessee by General Johnston, from the beginning of May, 1864, to July 18, 1864, when Hood succeeded to the command. But I do not see that any answer has been made from within the Confederate lines to General Hood's statement (page 336) that when on the night of the 9th of July the Confederate Army crossed the Chattahoochee River, "with one-third of their number lost," the men were "downcast, dispirited, and demoralized. Stragglers and deserters, the captured and killed, could not now, however, be replaced by recruits, because all the recruiting depots had been drained to reënforce either Lee or Johnston."

It is difficult to see what better Johnston could have done than adopt a Fabian policy during this time. If only it were possible to make the rank and file of an army understand the wisdom of such a policy at such a time, and to understand the advantages it would confer if discipline were strictly maintained,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and if its adoption did not tend seriously to discourage them, such a policy would be followed more frequently than it is, and it would often be a sure means to victory in the long run. But there are too many "ifs" in this proposition. The soldier is a human being and not a soulless machine; and a lengthened retreat, no matter how skilfully carried out, has always injured his fighting spirit, and I believe will always do so. The quotations I have already made from General Hood are strengthened by his reference, which can hardly be inaccurate, to the opinion of all his corps commanders. On the 15th of October they expressed the opinion that, although the army "had much improved in spirit, it was not in condition to risk battle against the numbers reported by General Wheeler." (Page 426.) It is true that in the meantime Hood had engaged in a series of offensive operations around Atlanta, but they were, at best, of doubtful value.

Taking the story as a whole, it seems to point out very clearly the practical danger, in its effect upon troops, of the most brilliant series of defensive actions, and that this is especially the case when those actions are fought behind earth-works constructed at each succeeding stage of a campaign, and further and further to the rear. I incline to think that something of the same kind of effect is to be noticed even in the army of General Lee from the time when the long series of earth-work operations began around Petersburg. General Hood's view of the condition of the Army of Tennessee at the time when he took over the command has been so far accepted, because it appears on the whole to be confirmed by other evidence and to be in accordance with the general experience of war in such cases. Moreover, General Sherman, with all his respect for Johnston, speaks of the superior *morale* of his own army at this time. General Hood accounts for his own ill-success on every occasion by pouring out blame upon his subordinate leaders. This sort of explanation cannot be accepted as strictly impartial history. In a recently-published volume of the Duke of Wellington's conversations there is a remark about Napoleon's campaign of 1814, which our great captain, like most educated soldiers, regarded as one of the most brilliant, if not the most brilliant, of all the performances of that great master of the art of war. The Duke, answering some characteristically flippant remark of Croker's on the subject, refers to the series of victories which Napoleon gained over army after

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army in that campaign, and then, speaking from his own vast experience, says: "I know *the nice calculation* of time and distance which is necessary to the working-out of such combinations."

Some commanders are said to be "unlucky," which may sometimes mean that fate has really been continuously adverse to them. Far more often, however, it means that, whilst in conception their paper schemes may have been brilliant, they have failed in those nice calculations of time, distance, and other points to which Wellington attributed Napoleon's victories. Hood was certainly an "unlucky" commander. It is unfortunate for his reputation that his old classmates of West Point, represented so largely in the Federal Army opposed to him, should have fully anticipated from the first that he would be "unlucky." In speaking of a general who had been continuously unsuccessful, Lord Beaconsfield said to me: "They say he is unlucky, but my experience leads me to believe that want of luck is too often only a want of skill." It is impossible to say at each point where fate and where miscalculation caused General Hood's ill-luck. His original scheme for moving into the heart of Tennessee, with a view to draw Sherman after him, was dashing in the extreme. It is, however, very difficult to believe that he could have successfully carried his army "through the gaps in the Cumberland Mountains" to "attack Grant in rear" (page 427), and so on to Petersburg, as he appears to have contemplated. This is just one of those elaborate combinations of which Napoleon has said that their only defect is that they never succeed. Fate certainly struck him hard when, having urged that the railway to Decatur should be repaired, and that large supplies of stores should be gathered at Tuscumbia, he found on his arrival that nothing had been done.

This is one of those cases in which the want of one effective military head to the Confederacy, of which I have spoken heretofore, appears to have been disastrous. The Confederacy should have been governed from Lee's headquarters. In any case, it is clear that General Sherman's calculations of time, distance, and the resisting power which the stalwart Thomas would be able to gather in Tennessee against Hood, were right, and that Genera Hood's were fallacious. On the whole, it would seem that, for once at least, fate decided between the commanders with the blind

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eyes of Justice. From the moment that General Sherman had decided upon the bold step of allowing Hood to do his worst in the rear of the Federal Army, the march of that army to the sea is a most interesting feat of arms, and had a most decisive effect on the result of the war. He justly urges that its importance did not depend so much on the success of his march from Atlanta to the sea as on the fact that at Savannah, after destroying the resources of the South, he was in a position to join hands with Grant by a march northward from Savannah to Goldsboro'. As he says, after the complete destruction of Hood's army by Thomas on December the 16th, 1864, this march from Savannah was "like the thrust of the sword toward the heart of the human body; each mile of advance swept aside all opposition, consumed the very food on which Lee's army depended for life, and demonstrated a power in the National Government which was irresistible." (Page 259).

Let us now return to the doings of Lee's army, which we left at Cold Harbor after the successful issue of its Wilderness campaign. Unfortunately for the readers of these papers, it requires a good deal of careful collation to get from them a clear picture of that most interesting period between June 3 and June 18, 1864—that is, between the end of the Wilderness battles at Cold Harbor and the time when, on June 18, at 11:30 A.M., Lee in person joined Beauregard before Petersburg. It was then that the siege of Lee's army by Grant may be said to have fairly begun. (Page 543.) It is necessary to compare Beauregard's "Four Days of Battle at Petersburg" with "General Grant on the Siege of Petersburg." In order to realize the circumstances under which at this time General Early was detached into the Shenandoah Valley, General Imboden's account of "The Battle of New Market" must be studied. The movements in the Shenandoah Valley, which, since Lee's retreat from Gettysburg, had led up to the battle of New Market and to the events which followed it, are also of importance. Briefly stated, it may be said that the Shenandoah Valley—one of the possible openings for supply which it was essential for Lee to keep open—had been for the moment secured to him by a success gained by Breckenridge over Sigel on May 15, 1864. It was not an unimportant event, because, during the Wilderness campaign, Lee could not have spared men to stop Sigel had he proved successful. But on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

May 21 Hunter superseded Sigel in the command of the Federal forces in the Shenandoah Valley, and began a series of movements which resulted, on June 5, in the defeat of the Confederates at Piedmont. Hunter pushed on with increased forces across the Blue Ridge, and moved upon Lynchburg.

It was under these circumstances that General Early, with Jackson's old corps, was despatched to reënforce the Confederates in the Shenandoah Valley, at the moment when Grant was arranging for the transfer of his army to join Butler before Petersburg. The battle of Cold Harbor had been fought on June 3, 1864, and on June 12 Early was despatched to the Shenandoah Valley. Then followed on that side what was the last offensive effort of the dying Confederacy, Early's march on Washington. By July 12 Early's retreat had begun from before Washington; by September 19 Sheridan had defeated him at Winchester, and on September 22 at Fisher's Hill. Despite an at first successful surprise of Sheridan's forces on October 19, Early's army on that day had been almost annihilated. Its destruction meant that one more of the avenues for food and supply was cut off from Lee's doomed army.

Meantime Grant's army had been transferred to the south of the James River, and for the time the Federal commander seems undoubtedly to have given Lee the slip. The movements began on the very day, June 12, that Early had started for the Shenandoah Valley. Up to this time General Beauregard had completely worsted Butler in all his attempts to employ his army against Petersburg or Richmond. The scheme which Beauregard describes on page 198, under the title of "The Defence of Drewry's Bluff," was proposed by him on May 12, 1864, for the destruction of Butler's army. It seems to have been wise and clever, and, as far as one can judge, it was then *the* scheme most likely to give a brilliant result. General Beauregard's idea was that an immediate, though temporary, transfer of 10,000 men from Lee's army, together with the addition of the troops in Richmond, to his own army south of the James River, would make him strong enough to destroy Butler. After Butler had been disposed of, his plan was that with this combined force he should fall upon the left of Grant's army. Until Butler had been disposed of, Lee was to fall back and take up a defensive position covering Richmond. This plan of operation certainly looks as if it were not only feasi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ble, but one that would have afforded the best opportunity which the situation offered to the two Confederate armies. If carried out, it would have taken place during the five days' lull which succeeded the battle of Spotsylvania. If we are to judge by the success with which at Drewry's Bluff, on May 16, Beauregard rolled back Butler's army, and the narrowness with which that army avoided destruction,—owing its escape, in fact, to the error of General Whiting,—there does not seem any reason to doubt that General Beauregard's proposal, if vigorously carried out, might have been big with great results for the Confederacy. The only doubt seems to be whether food and transport could have been provided for Lee's already starving soldiers during the movement.

In any case, it seems clear that here again the want of a commander-in-chief over all the Confederate armies interfered with the possible execution of such a plan, and, indeed, it would seem, with any adequate and effective coöperation between the two armies of Lee and Beauregard, till they actually effected their junction. The situation when Grant's army began to reënforce Butler, and the four days' fighting before Petersburg commenced, is very noteworthy. A comparison of General Grant's account of those days' proceedings with that given by General Beauregard will show that, whilst, on the one hand, Lee was not aware that Grant's army had left his front, on the other, the Federals were completely imposed upon by the slender force which was interposed between them and Petersburg. The incident is thoroughly characteristic of the history of war, and suggests, not any hostile criticism of the commanders, but rather a reflection as to the strange conditions under which the command of great bodies of men had to be exercised in a country such as was then the field of operations.

The importance of the advantage which Grant had over Lee in this all-decisive matter of unity of command comes out strikingly here. First, when apparently, on May 12, it might have been possible for a large detachment from Lee's army to reënforce Beauregard, and, after defeating Butler, to join in an attack on Grant—an attack which, if successful, would have had decisive results. In the almost pathetic correspondence (pages 244–245) between Lee and Beauregard, there is in Lee's telegrams something almost like irritation at the fact that General Beauregard

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wanted some one at Richmond to give him definite orders as to the force he should then send to Lee. Lee evidently felt that the event was one of such paramount importance that it ought to have been entirely and exclusively in his own hands. Yet he was compelled by a faulty and disastrous system of military administration and command to leave the question in Beauregard's hands. "The result of your delay will be disaster. Butler's troops will be with Grant to-morrow," is the expression of a man intensely anxious, who feels that at a critical moment he can only request assistance from a coequal ally, whilst his opponent has the absolute disposal of all the forces in his theatre of war. It is not to find fault with Beauregard that this is written. His great ability as a general, his loyalty, and his honesty of purpose are beyond criticism. The object is to emphasize the necessity of unity of command in war, for without it success must always be doubtful.

When General Grant, on June 12, began his transfer of force towards Petersburg, it is clear that his success in effecting that movement was due to his being able to act as commander-in-chief of the two armies of Meade and Butler. General Lee, on the other hand, could only act as commander of the Army of Northern Virginia, and was at a disadvantage when he received from Beauregard—to whom he could not send orders—only warnings of what was taking place in his own immediate front. Information so received could not affect Lee's mind with the same force or certainty as the daily collected information received at his own headquarters would have done, had he been the commander in-chief of all the armies in that theatre of war. To those who are not familiar with the systematic working of the headquarters of a large army in these respects, it may be difficult to convey an idea of the enormous practical difference between the two sets of facts. The political exigencies of the moment often render the temptation very strong to adopt some such arrangement as that of the Confederates at this time, in which a sort of general headquarters for the two armies is established at the political capital. It is well, therefore, to insist here upon the important effect which it produced upon this part of the campaign.

The situation in the South at this time, when Bragg was acting as Mr. Davis's "chief of the staff," was almost exactly analogous to the situation at the North until General Grant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

took supreme command. During all the time that elapsed between the appointment of General Halleck to a position nominally more dignified, but practically that of chief of the staff to Mr. Lincoln, and the moment when Grant assumed command of all the armies and took the field, General Halleck, in Washington, virtually directed all military operations under the President's authority. Grant reduced Halleck to his proper position, that of staff officer to himself, the commander-in-chief in the field. That in each instance the result was disastrous few who seriously study these papers will deny. There is so much in the arrangement that is plausible to a cabinet of civilians, and as it is one that may entail the most fatal consequences upon a nation, attention cannot be too forcibly drawn to it. To consider it rightly, the circumstances under which Halleck was appointed, apparently very much at the suggestion of General Pope, should be carefully studied. We have no explanation afforded as to the circumstances which led to the appointment of General Bragg, but probably they were very similar to those of which we have in General Pope's paper a full account in the case of General Halleck.

The final struggle now fairly began. The fate of Lee's army, despite the heroic resistance which it offered and the alternate successes and failures of the Crater battle and the sally against Fort Stedman, was being surely decided by events beyond its own immediate field. The fall of Fort Fisher on January 15, 1865, cut off an avenue of supply without which Lee had declared it would be impossible to feed his army. The advance of Sherman's army and the destruction of General Early in the Shenandoah Valley were events that closed in the net tighter and tighter around Lee's army, until, as Sherman says (page 259), by March, 1865, there was only one move left to Lee, viz., to abandon Richmond, join Johnston in North Carolina, and, if possible, destroy Sherman, and then turn upon Grant. General Sherman assumes that political considerations alone deterred Lee from carrying out this programme, although Sherman himself suggests that its success was problematical at best. All the evidence goes to show that Lee's troops were already starving, and almost without any means of transport. He, therefore, most probably did not attempt this move because he knew it had become impossible. After General Sheridan's gallant attack upon and capture of Five Forks from the famished and broken men of the old Army of Northern Vir-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ginia, the impossible had then to be attempted by Lee, and it soon become apparent how hopeless was the attempt. The military interest of the great struggle was over; the forces had become too unequal. The closing scenes were strikingly dramatic in their character; but all operations that could be of interest to the military critic ended long before Appomattox Court-House was reached.

The perusal of these papers has revived my remembrance of this great struggle and of the impressions it left upon me at the time. The routine of military duty had stationed me in the neighboring Dominion of Canada while this mighty fight was going on. It is not easy to describe the breathless interest and excitement with which from month to month, almost from day to day, we English soldiers read and studied every report that could be obtained of the war as it proceeded. No doubt many of our impressions of the facts, as we received them at the moment, required to be corrected by subsequent investigation. It takes a long time before the facts can be thoroughly threshed out from the mass of evidence bearing upon the complicated events of a great war that spread over a mighty continent. Nevertheless, in one respect, at all events, the broad impressions then formed are confirmed by the conclusions since arrived at, both from the more elaborate histories and from this most valuable series of papers. I refer to the opinion that, amid the crowds of able men, of gallant soldiers, and of clever statesmen whom the epoch of the American Civil War produced, the two men Abraham Lincoln and Robert Lee stand out a head and shoulders above all others. Neither of them was free from human error. Experience and the teaching of history warn us that perfection is a myth. But how great were both of these two great men in their several spheres! How modest, how wise, how self-restrained, how generous, how large in their views, and how grandly patriotic, as each understood patriotism!

An eminent Greek master taught that mortals are to be judged happy or otherwise according to the ending of their lives. Judging by this test, is it Abraham Lincoln or Robert Lee that we should regard as the favorite of the gods? It was Mr. Lincoln's fate to be struck down by the assassin at the moment when the cause for which he had lived and struggled had absolutely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

triumphed—a circumstance which has forever identified his death with the life of his country. Was this a nobler death than Lee's? He, the foremost man in the Confederacy, the General, the idol of the South, retired from his high command to a private, a humble position. He refused repeated offers of wealth and comfort, in order to devote his remaining years to serve his ruined State in the way in which he believed he could be most useful to it—namely, the education of her sons and the training of her citizens, by his great example, to have faith in Virginia's future. One hardly knows which ending the Greek master of old would have admired the more.

One other remark before closing this series of articles, which have at least afforded me most interesting work, whether my humble criticism shall or shall not be profitable to others. I make it with considerable diffidence, both because I am a soldier and because I am not a citizen of the United States. As a soldier, it may be thought that I am prejudiced in what I say, and as an Englishman, that I can only speak of the effect of the great American Civil War from the outside rather than from within. What I have to say is that if one were compelled to choose between condoling with American friends on the terrible misfortunes they underwent in that war, or of congratulating them upon the ennobling effect which that war has had upon their people, one would unhesitatingly congratulate them upon the fact that such stirring and ennobling incidents as those which fill the volumes I have reviewed did occur in American history, a quarter of a century ago.

It has been said—foolishly, I think—that the nation is happy whose annals are uninteresting. If anything so preposterous could be true, we should thank God to have been born in a country every page of whose history was replete with heart-stirring events. To eat the fruits of the ground in a warm, balmy climate, with all sorts of comforts round one, may furnish the materials for a happy, passive, uneventful, almost vegetable existence in equatorial Africa. But would there be any pride in belonging to the Anglo-Saxon race if we had no Crécy, Agincourt, Armada, or other glorious achievement of our ancestors to look back upon? What would England be if there had been no Marlborough, no Wellington, no Nelson, no Chatham, Pitt, or Clive, or Warren Hastings—no "men of action"? And since the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greatest writers have always breathed the patriotic spirit of their own times, no Shakespeare, no Milton either? How could any Miltons or Shakespeares have been born in a country of purely bovine delights, whose history was a blank? Without war, there would, in fact, be no history at all. And yet, without any doubt, the statesman or the soldier who would not devote all his energies to save his country from what all must regard as the appalling calamity of civil war, or indeed from any war, would be an unprincipled villain. But when all has been done that can be done by statesmen or soldiers to stave off the calamity, surely the effects of war upon the country are not all bad. It is a fearful evil, but an evil for which greater good often compensates. Would the United States now prefer to have had no Washington, no Lincoln, none of the many heroes of the War of Independence and of the Civil War, in order to blot out the record of all war from the pages of its history? Would it be better for the future generations of American citizens that, as mere characters, all such heroes as Robert Lee and Stonewall Jackson should never have lived and fought?

In the nation that has never gone through the fiery ordeal of war,—if there be such a nation,—that has never had to encounter circumstances of difficulty and of danger which have threatened its very existence, that has never endured calamities which have tested its men's fibre, there can be no great characters, no lofty figures. It is not a noble, a glorious, or an admirable epoch in the history of any people when the great hero of the hour is the best platform orator or the best money-grubber.

I close the pages of this volume with a sincere feeling of thankfulness and pride that I belong to the race from which sprang the soldiers and sailors who fought upon both sides in this memorable struggle. Who can say which to admire the more—the Southern pluck and daring, or the stern, sober determination which eventually led the North to victory?

WOLSELEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LORD WOLSELEY ANSWERED.

BY GENERAL JAMES B. FRY.

LORD WOLSELEY'S comments upon the Civil War should be read in the light of the fact, announced in his fourth article, that they are based entirely upon the accounts given in the book called "Battles and Leaders of the Civil War."

That remarkable work is a record of what the principal actors on both sides of a great war said of their own deeds some twenty years after the contest. It is hardly necessary to mention that such a record is fallible, as well as valuable. The "War Book" is not a history of the Civil War. On the other hand, it is not merely a compilation of careless fireside stories of old soldiers in retirement. It is a record of the deliberate testimony of the principal witnesses in a great trial of arms, given to the world with the soldier's certificate of honor, and set down under the advice and guidance of counsel. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Buel, the editors under whom the "War Book" was prepared, soon became, if they were not in the beginning, experts in matters of the Civil War, and were, in fact, able and impartial counsel for their contributors. The articles were written and published in good faith, but they are *ex parte,* not all correct, and not conclusive. The work is without a parallel, and is of the greatest value and interest; but just criticism of the Civil War calls for a full consideration of all the evidence, the general accounts of the period, diaries, memoirs, etc., and especially the official records,—the testimony which the "War Book" witnesses and others gave at the time.

Lord Wolseley's purpose is to draw military lessons for his own people, and for that the "War Book" may be sufficient. A military lesson may be deduced from an assumed or an established case; but reputations can be fairly dealt with only in the latter. The facts should be collected from all quarters before actors, whether civil or military, in the field or in the bureau, are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

convicted. While Lord Wolseley will not dispute this principle, he has not adhered rigidly to it.

For example, his condemnation of Halleck is unsparing; he blames him for conveying to Meade the President's displeasure at the failure to pursue Lee vigorously; and, without any knowledge of what Halleck did say, condemns him for not saying to the President certain brave things, which he now thinks Halleck ought to have said; and taunts him by adding: "What pursuit had Halleck carried out after Shiloh? Of all men in the war, Halleck was the last who ought to have reproached another man for not adequately reaping the fruits of victory."

The truth is, Halleck had nothing to do with the battle of Shiloh or the pursuit which was not carried out. That was in Grant's hands. Halleck was at St. Louis, hundreds of miles away, when the battle was fought, and did not reach the field for nearly a week after the fight was over and the enemy was within his lines at Corinth.

Without undertaking to present Halleck's case, it is only fair to note that he was dead long before the "*Century* War Book" was thought of; and that there is nothing in that book which was written in his behalf. As Lord Wolseley's criticisms of him are based wholly upon that authority, his Lordship has in this instance condemned a fellow-soldier without a hearing. Lord Wolseley says: "No one who has himself realized the practical difficulties of command in the field is much inclined to any slap-dash criticism of those who are engaged in high command." It would be hard to find a more striking example of the "slap-dash criticism," which Lord Wolseley disclaims, than his treatment of Halleck presents.

It must, I think, be admitted that Lord Wolseley's military criticisms upon the war, *as he sees it through the Century articles*, are, in general, sound; and in presenting them he has made an interesting contribution to the profession. It is a merit in his work that he recognizes and sets forth the influence of the navy upon the contest. While special feats of that branch of the service have been chronicled and duly credited, the public mind has never fully taken in the real effect of the navy's part upon joint operations, upon the glory of particular generals, and upon the final result of the contest. Lord Wolseley has rendered an important service in giving prominence to this point.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The one great lesson which Lord Wolseley sees in our Civil War is that civil rulers should not meddle in military affairs.

"It is the old, old story over again," he says, "of civil rulers who blunder, and, failing to foresee events, sacrifice everything to a momentary popularity, in order to divert popular wrath from themselves to the unfortunate soldiers who have been their victims." "The lesson which is most impressed upon me by a study of these campaigns is the danger there always is of popular irritability and ignorant impatience preventing a general from doing the very thing which would, if time were allowed, surely gain the ends which the people desire."

Is not this, in the free countries of Great Britain and the United States, complaining of the inevitable? "Let us clearly understand," Lord Wolseley says, "that the prisoner at the bar is 'Public Opinion,'" "that hoary-headed and cruel old rascal," who is "entirely ignorant," but who issues "decrees" upon which governments are compelled to act. That "prisoner" is not subject to military jurisdiction. Soldiers may bring him before courts-martial as a witness, but not as a prisoner. Is it worth while for them to spend time in England or the United States trying to sentence or silence him? That President Lincoln was "compelled to act" by the decrees of public opinion, and that he was forced to say to McClellan, "Once more let us tell you, it is indispensable to *you* that you strike a blow! I am powerless to help this," is quite true. The practical questions are, What should the soldier have done? What did he do under this "decree," whether the "ignorant old rascal, public opinion," ought to have issued the decree or not?

Lord Wolseley treats the subject as if the war was a strictly military question which could have been settled by one or two pitched battles if the military leaders had had their own way; and he seems to think they ought to have been permitted to decide how many soldiers their governments should raise, how much time should be spent in preparing them for the work in hand, and when, where, and how the work should be done. That is about the view General McClellan took of the subject. He proposed to take all the time he thought necessary for preparation and then, as he said, "crush the rebels in one campaign." But the war was not a technical or professional one. It was a civil war, a resort to arms upon a principle by the people of two sections of the country separated practically by the slave-line, without an army on either side at the beginning. No battle, or two or three battles, however great or how-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever decisive as mere feats of arms, could have greatly hastened the result. The questions at issue, the character and relations to each other of the people engaged, and the vast extent and natural features and resources of the South enforced upon the North a war of exhaustion and occupation. There were about twenty-three millions of whites in the North, to about five millions in the South; but the productive interests of the South were cared for by a thoroughly-organized, well-trained, and efficient labor system composed of about three millions and a half of docile blacks born to slavery and brought up to work, males and females alike, in the field or elsewhere at the will of their masters. Assuming, as I do, that the North was bound to succeed, conquest and occupation were inevitable. That required time, and imposed upon the North what Lord Wolseley speaks of as the "continued and systematic process of attrition applied by the Northern generals." This process of "attrition" was not a form of generalship which the Northern commanders were at liberty to accept or reject. It was a condition of things to which Northern generals were obliged to apply the art of war.

Speaking of the organization of the Army of the Potomac by McClellan, Lord Wolseley says:

"That most cruel tyrant, the 'public,' had no means of realizing the difficulties to be overcome. . . . As the months of 1862 went by, the universal feeling was one of restlessness and impatience at what was deemed the waste of time and the useless delay which were taking place. Under this impression, and under the force which this so-formed Public Opinion was exciting, the administration at Washington found itself forced to act."

This was a condition of things for the military leader in a republic to respect, not to resent. McClellan at first knew that, but soon after he reached Washington and took command he seemed to forget that he was a subordinate general of the Republic, and to become completely dominated by the belief that he had been chosen by Providence as the saviour of his country. That was fatal to him. He reached Washington July 26, an able, energetic, trusted young general. By October Washington was quite well fortified, and a great army, organized, armed, equipped, and fairly well drilled,—outnumbering the enemy two or three to one —rested behind its line of intrenchments. The offensive was demanded from all quarters and in all ways, soldiers as well as civilians making the demand. McClellan would not move. He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remained stationary until the enemy, to whom he was vastly superior in numbers and preparation, moved off in February.

So, too, notwithstanding the "decrees," did McClellan have his own way in the plan of campaign. The President advocated the direct overland route; McClellan the Peninsula route. The latter was adopted, the campaign failed, and Lord Wolseley says Mr. Lincoln "wrecked an ably-devised plan for the advance upon Richmond of all the available Federal forces by one single line," etc.

The Peninsula campaign failed on account of delays arising from natural obstacles and because McClellan did not handle his army to advantage. Upon any line adopted he was sure to find the main Confederate army between him and Richmond. The movement to the Peninsula necessarily divided his own forces and concentrated those of the enemy, and in the end he was forced against intrenchments quite as formidable as those he dreaded at Manassas. The Peninsula line, however, was a true one. It afforded two immediate objectives—the rebel army and the rebel capital. Furthermore, it enabled the coöperation of the navy and required but a short line of supply, about twelve miles by railroad.

It cannot be said to a certainty that the detention of McDowell's corps by the President did or did not prevent McClellan's success on the Peninsula; but it must be borne in mind that Franklin's division of McDowell's corps was, at McClellan's urgent request, sent to him after only a week's delay, and McCall's division of that corps was sent to him and arrived while he was on the Chickahominy; thus giving him the best two-thirds of McDowell's corps, before the enemy drove him to the James River.

McClellan himself practically admits that the detention of troops for the security of Washington was not the cause of his failure, by giving in his "own story," long after the war, a specific and different cause. It is this: On May 18 the Secretary of War addressed a letter to McClellan in reply to a call for McDowell's corps to be sent by water, in which the Secretary said:

"The President is not willing to uncover the capital entirely, and it is believed that, even if this were prudent, it would require more time to effect a junction between your army and that of the Rappahannock by way of the Potomac and York rivers than by a land march. In order, therefore, to increase the strength of the attack upon Richmond at the earliest moment, General McDowell has been ordered to march upon that city by the shortest route. He is ordered, keeping himself always

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in position to save the capital from all possible attack, so to operate as to put his left wing in communication with your right wing, and you are instructed to co-öperate so as to establish this communication as soon as possible, by extending your right wing to the north of Richmond."

McClellan says in his own story:

"This order rendered it impossible for me to use the James River as a line of operations, *forced me to establish our depots on the Pamunky and to approach Richmond from the north. Herein lay the failure of the campaign.* As it was impossible to get at Richmond and the enemy's army covering it without crossing the Chickahominy, I was obliged to divide the Army of the Potomac into two parts separated by that river."

There is the cause of his failure clearly and deliberately stated by McClellan himself long after the war. It refutes the charge that the detention of troops for the safety of Washington was the cause. But, strange to say, McClellan's statement that he was forced by Stanton's letter of May 18 to establish his depots on the Pamunky, etc., is erroneous. Lord Wolseley has accepted the foregoing statement from McClellan and says of Stanton:

"It was he who thrust forward the force under McDowell, and *so entailed upon McClellan the necessity of placing himself in that false position astride of the Chickahominy which led to all the misfortunes of this campaign.*"

The facts of record are that McClellan had established his depots on the Pamunky before Stanton's telegram of May 18 was sent. He had taken locomotives and cars in his transports for the purpose of using the railroad from White House to Richmond as his line of operations. He arrived in person at White House on May 16, having then passed the last point at which he could turn towards the James River, and wrote to his wife, May 17, "We expect to have our advance parties near Bottom's bridge to-day," said all the bridges were burned, but that "this river is fordable, so the difficulty is not insurmountable by any means"; showing that he intended to encounter the Chickahominy, but did not expect it to be a serious obstacle. On the 18th of May he wrote: "We will go to Tunnstall's or perhaps a little beyond it, and will soon close up on the Chickahominy, and find out what Secesh is doing. I think he will fight us *there, or between there and Richmond.*" Here was McClellan, with his depots on the Pamunky and his troops on the Chickahominy, expecting a battle "*between there and Richmond,*" before the letter of May 18, which, he says, forced him to the Pamunky and Chickahominy, was written. It is not only true that he was there without orders from Washington, but it is also true that before leaving Washing-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ton he intended to go there. In a report to the Secretary of War, dated March 19, he said :

"I have the honor to submit the following notes on the proposed operations of the active portion of the Army of the Potomac. The proposed plan of campaign is to assume Fort Monroe as the first base of operations, *taking the line of Yorktown and West Point upon Richmond as the line of operations*, Richmond being the objective point. It is assumed that the fall of Richmond involves that of Norfolk and the whole of Virginia; *also that we shall fight a decisive battle between West Point and Richmond. It is also clear that West Point should, as soon as possible, be reached and used as our main depot.*"

There the objective, the base, the main depot, and the line of operations—upon which he expected to fight a decisive battle "between West Point and Richmond"—are laid down with mathematical and soldierly accuracy by McClellan himself before leaving Washington, and he indicated no purpose to change the base, depot, or line until the enemy turned his right flank late in June. To this it might be added that there is nothing to show that McClellan, at the time, or when giving his testimony to the Committee on the Conduct of the War concerning the cause of failure, asserted or pretended that he was forced to the Pamunky and Chickahominy, or that he had any objection to that base and line. Instead, therefore, of being forced to that "false position astride of the Chickahominy" by Stanton's letter of May 18, the position was deliberately assumed upon McClellan's own judgment.

Lord Wolseley says :

'The one just defence which McClellan is able to offer for the dangerous division of his army astride the Chickahominy is that, according to his statement,—and it is undisputed,—that distribution of his troops was expressly ordered from Washington, the object being that he might keep in communication with the force under McDowell."

Having proved, as I think, that McClellan himself chose his base, his depot, and his line of operations, and placed himself upon the Chickahominy before the order of May 18 was issued (which is relied upon wholly as the order of the Washington authorities in the case), and it being the fact that he promptly put his army astride the Chickahominy on May 20 by his own orders, it seems unnecessary to say more upon that point. The case does not sustain Lord Wolseley's lesson against governmental interference with generals in the field, or the assertion that Lincoln wrecked McClellan's ably-devised campaign.

Lord Wolseley speaks with proper commendation of the Confederate attack upon McClellan's left, called the battle of Seven

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pines, and remarks, very justly: "All that failed was the execution." He says: "The moment selected for the attack was happily chosen immediately after the river had risen in sudden flood." While this statement concerning the time chosen is not to be contradicted, it calls, on historical grounds, for some qualification. When Johnston ordered the attack on April 30, the Chickahominy was high, but McClellan had several bridges by which he could cross to support his left wing. During the night of the 30th–31st, *after the attack had been ordered,* the rain fell in torrents, thus swelling the stream so that bridges were swept away next day, and the Union left was greatly imperilled. Lord Wolseley says:

"General Longstreet's division was so long in getting into position and preparing for attack that the whole scheme of General J. E. Johnston miscarried;" and elsewhere: "Nothing could have enabled the Federal forces to the north of the Chickahominy to arrive in time to support the left, or the left to escape over the Chickahominy, if the Confederate corps had taken their proper directions."

This conclusion may be questioned. The Federal forces north of the Chickahominy would have moved to the support of the left as soon as they received notice of the attack, just as they did move at 2 P.M., and if the attack had been made as early as intended, the Federals would have had one more bridge to cross upon, and roads less rain-soaked to move over. The failure probably was not due to the time of the attack or the time of the arrival of supports for the Federal left. It is attributable to the fact that Longstreet's division was not brought to bear upon Keyes's right flank—the weak part of the line.

Two main roads, the Williamsburg road and the Nine-Mile road, lying at safe and convenient distances apart, led from the Confederate camp, and intersected at the point occupied by Keyes's right, thus enabling an easy concentration of the Confederates for attack. The Nine-Mile road led directly to the exposed Federal flank. When the attack was ordered (April 30), Longstreet's division was on the Nine-Mile road; and it was ordered to proceed to the attack by that road, while D. H. Hill's division was ordered to attack by the Williamsburg road, upon which it was lying. This would have concentrated a powerful force upon the Federals, bringing Longstreet upon their weakest point. But instead of proceeding by the Nine-Mile road, as directed, Longstreet marched his division across to the Williamsburg road and fell in behind Hill. That was the gravest fault in execution which marks the affair.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Wolseley's picture of the military situation and the magical effect of McClellan's assumption of command after Pope's defeat is graphic and highly colored, but somewhat misleading. He speaks of the "abject panic," and says (of McClellan):

"As the disorganization of the army was directly attributable to his absence from it so his presence with it—hailed as it was by all ranks—was, of itself, sufficient to restore it to order and efficiency." "All at once he heard nothing around him but enthusiastic demands to be led forward to victory from the very men who, till he joined them, were only seeking safety in individual flight."

There is no good ground for the assertion that the "disorganization of the army was directly attributable" to McClellan's "absence from it"; but the main point for consideration here—which Lord Wolseley seems to have overlooked—is that the Army of the Potomac had not been defeated or disorganized in Pope's campaign. Only a little more than one corps of that army had been seriously engaged under Pope, and though that fraction had suffered heavily, it had lost neither spirit nor organization. The other corps of the Army of the Potomac were in good order, and had not been engaged since the seven-days' fight on the Peninsula, nearly two months before. They constituted the main body of the army which McClellan led forth with promptness and energy to battle with Lee, who was moving into Maryland. It was, in fact, McClellan's own army from the Peninsula, not Pope's army from Manassas.

At that time McClellan was himself. The lash of adversity had subdued the fancy that he was the chosen saviour, and left at work in him nothing but the general that he really was. On the 7th of September he wrote his wife: "The feeling of the government toward me, I am sure, is kind and trusting. I hope by God's blessing to justify the confidence they now repose in me, and will bury the past in oblivion." But as soon as the Battle of Antietam was over, ten days later (September 17), the saviour hallucination again took precedence, and he began to seek the suppression of the authorities set over him by his country, calling them "difficulties" in his path. On the 20th of September he wrote:

"I feel some little pride in having, with a beaten and demoralized army, defeated Lee so utterly and saved the North so completely. Since I left Washington Stanton has again asserted that I, not Pope, lost the battle of Manassas No. 2! I am tired of fighting against such disadvantages, and feel that it is now time for the country to *come to my help* and *remove these difficulties from my path.* I feel that I have done all that can be asked in *twice saving the country.* If I continue in its service I have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at least, the right to demand a guarantee that I shall not be interfered with. I know I cannot have that assurance as long as Stanton continues in the position of Secretary of War, and Halleck as General-in-Chief."

The subordinate general commanding in the field, who announced on the 7th the "kind feeling" and "great confidence" of the government, and "buried the past in oblivion," after two weeks of military success was again the Saviour of the Country, demanding the removal from his path of the Secretary of War and the General-in-Chief! The result was six weeks of exasperating and contentious delay on the Potomac, followed, a few days later, by his removal from command when on the march, at the time of all times that he ought not to have been removed or interfered with.

Lord Wolseley's comments upon the great operations of the last two years of the war, especially Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Vicksburg, and Gettysburg, are so meagre as to be disappointing.

He says that Stoneman's raid caused the "loss of the battle of Chancellorsville," adding: "The more one considers that battle, the more clear it becomes that it was the absence of the Federal cavalry which made possible Jackson's turning movement." His Lordship has not seized what seem to me to be the controlling facts. Stoneman's movement was a proper part of a good plan. It left Hooker enough cavalry under Pleasanton to serve as "eyes" for the army. If the presence of Stoneman's cavalry would have prevented the division of the enemy's forces,—Jackson making a fifteen-mile march around the Federal army,—Hooker ought to have been thankful that it was away. But, instead of beating Lee's army in detail, he devoted all his energy and four days to slipping out from between the two parts of it, doing them as little harm as practicable in getting away. "Fighting Joe" was demoralized. Why it was so is not to be discussed here; but the lesson of that battle, as I view the subject, is not that it was a blunder to send Stoneman's cavalry to break Lee's communications.

Lord Wolseley closes his fourth article by saying:

"The decisions from Washington and the criticisms from Washington, based upon the loose and rampant public opinion of the day, were in every instance wrong, and were disastrous to the cause of the Union"; and he warns "the survivors* of the

*Probably misprint, meaning successors.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

administration" against "interference in the conduct of war—the most difficult of all arts—without any knowledge of its methods or of its principles."

Both the assertion and the admonition seem too broad. It is not to be admitted that the "decisions" and "criticisms" from Washington were "in every instance wrong, and were disastrous to the Union"; nor is it sound doctrine, as implied, that the government should be silent about military operations. Perhaps the rule should be for the administration to speak plainly and positively concerning the object and general scope of the campaign. After that, the discretion and individual responsibility of the general should not be curtailed by orders, nor should he be disturbed by perplexing advice. But popular governments do not always adhere to such rules; and departures from them, real or alleged, give rise to disputes in which there may be, and generally are, right and wrong on both sides.

The glory of military success goes to the general in the field; but in case of defeat the blame is likely to be thrown upon the home government, if it has given an order by which the general can claim that he was controlled or influenced. Yet failure may result from bad plans and from badly-executed good orders, as well as from bad orders. In the matter of the relative merit of the orders he issued and the way they were executed, Lincoln's record will bear the closest scrutiny. The subject is too extensive and too technical for more than a brief notice here. Lincoln's so-called wrecking of McClellan's plans has already been sketched.

Burnside succeeded McClellan at Warrentown, November 9, 1862. His career as commander of the Army of the Potomac ended with the disastrous affair of Fredericksburg, and he was removed January 25, 1863. It is unjust to charge Burnside's failure to Halleck, as Lord Wolseley does. Burnside's plan of campaign and plan of battle were his own. In his report to Halleck, dated December 17, 1863, he says:

"The fact that I decided to move from Warrentown on to this line, rather against the opinion of the President, Secretary, and yourself, and that you have left the whole management in my hands without giving me orders, makes me the more responsible, . . . The movement was made earlier than you expected, and after the President, Secretary, and yourself requested me not to be in haste."

Instead of resorting to this official report, made at the time by Burnside himself, sustaining the administration and Halleck, Lord Wolseley condemns them, and depicts Halleck as a military demagogue, upon a story told in the "Century War Book" by a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Confederate officer of a conversation he says he had with Burnside under a flag of truce, while sitting "on a log," "provided with crackers, cheese, sardines, and a bottle of brandy."

The case of Fredericksburg is a bad one for Lord Wolseley's lesson of non-interference with the general in the field. Chancellorsville is not much better. Burnside was replaced by Hooker January 25, 1863. The next day Lincoln wrote Hooker a remarkable letter, in which he said:

"Only those generals who gain successes can set up dictators. What I now ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship. . . . Beware of rashness, but with energy and sleepless vigilance go forward and give us victories."

Hooker made his own plans, took the initiative, turned Lee's left, drew him out of his stronghold on the heights of Fredericksburg, and, with advantage of position and two men to the enemy's one, stole back to his camp without really fighting a battle.

Hooker was succeeded by Meade, who won the battle of Gettysburg. Lincoln knew that by the successes at Vicksburg and Gettysburg the contest was practically decided in our favor, and he desired a vigorous pursuit. On the 6th of July he expressed himself accordingly to Halleck. Undoubtedly Lincoln's action is in the nature of interference with the general in the field, but there was nothing "disastrous to the Union" in it.

When by the 16th of October (1863) nothing had been accomplished by Meade since the battle of Gettysburg, Lincoln wrote Halleck:

"If General Meade can now attack him [Lee] on a field no more than equal for us, and will do so with all the skill and courage which he, his officers and men possess, the honor will be his if he succeeds, and the blame may be mine if he fails."

If this was interference, it was of a manly kind. Nothing came of it.

Soon after this Grant assumed general control of all military operations, and personal supervision in Virginia. I have never seen it stated that he was unduly interfered with.

It cannot be disputed that there was some interference with military operations by the Washington authorities, due partly to popular clamor. In my judgment, however, it was not so frequent or so injurious as represented, and, good or bad, the advice given was sometimes unavoidable, because it was asked for.

Burnside was so communicative that Halleck found it necessary to telegraph him (December 10, 1863): "I beg you not to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

telegraph details of your plans, nor the time of your intended movements. No secret can be kept that passes through so many hands." It was in response to a despatch from Hooker, sent when Lee was moving from his front for the Gettysburg campaign, that Lincoln advised—wisely, I think—against crossing the Rappahannock to attack the Confederate rear-guard. Lord Wolseley says of this incident:

"The mere suggestion by Hooker that to attack Lee's right was the proper course to pursue was sufficient to cause the removal of that general from his command."

This is incorrect and unjust. No penalty was imposed upon Hooker for the suggestion to attack Lee's right, except the clear exposition by Lincoln of the folly of such a movement. His removal was determined upon long before the suggestion was made. Special causes delayed it some weeks. Late in June, Hooker applied to be relieved, and his application was promptly granted June 28, the cause being the unfitness he had shown at Chancellorsville.

Time only can test the correctness of Lord Wolseley's prediction that for "most of the misfortunes experienced by the Federal troops, the verdict of history will ultimately hold responsible the administration at Washington rather than the generals who commanded in the field." I do not believe it. His conclusion (whether consistent or not with his prediction) that "amid the crowds of able men, of gallant soldiers, and of clever statesmen whom the epoch of the American Civil War produced, the two men Abraham Lincoln and Robert Lee stand out a head and shoulders above all others," may be contested as to Lee, but never as to Lincoln.

JAMES B. FRY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC?

BY ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

PART I.

"With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls."

The same rules or laws of probability must govern in religious questions as in others. There is no subject—and can be none—concerning which any human being is under any obligation to believe without evidence. Neither is there any intelligent being who can, by any possibility, be flattered by the exercise of ignorant credulity. The man who, without prejudice, reads and understands the Old and New Testaments will cease to be an orthodox Christian. The intelligent man who investigates the religion of any country without fear and without prejudice will not and cannot be a believer.

Most people, after arriving at the conclusion that Jehovah is not God, that the Bible is not an inspired book, and that the Christian religion, like other religions, is the creation of man, usually say: "There must be a Supreme Being, but Jehovah is not his name, and the Bible is not his word. There must be somewhere an over-ruling Providence or Power."

This position is just as untenable as the other. He who cannot harmonize the cruelties of the Bible with the goodness of Jehovah, cannot harmonize the cruelties of Nature with the goodness and wisdom of a supposed Deity. He will find it impossible to account for pestilence and famine, for earthquake and storm, for slavery, for the triumph of the strong over the weak, for the countless victories of injustice. He will find it impossible to account for martyrs—for the burning of the good, the noble, the loving, by the ignorant, the malicious, and the infamous.

How can the Deist satisfactorily account for the sufferings of women and children? In what way will he justify religious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

persecution—the flame and sword of religious hatred? Why did his God sit idly on his throne and allow his enemies to wet their swords in the blood of his friends? Why did he not answer the prayers of the imprisoned, of the helpless? And when he heard the lash upon the naked back of the slave, why did he not also hear the prayer of the slave? And when children were sold from the breasts of mothers, why was he deaf to the mother's cry?

It seems to me that the man who knows the limitations of the mind, who gives the proper value to human testimony, is necessarily an Agnostic. He gives up the hope of ascertaining first or final causes, of comprehending the supernatural, or of conceiving of an infinite personality. From out the words Creator, Preserver, and Providence, all meaning falls.

The mind of man pursues the path of least resistance, and the conclusions arrived at by the individual depend upon the nature and structure of his mind, on his experience, on hereditary drifts and tendencies, and on the countless things that constitute the difference in minds. One man, finding himself in the midst of mysterious phenomena, comes to the conclusion that all is the result of design; that back of all things is an infinite personality—that is to say, an infinite man; and he accounts for all that is by simply saying that the universe was created and set in motion by this infinite personality, and that it is miraculously and supernaturally governed and preserved. This man sees with perfect clearness that matter could not create itself, and therefore he imagines a creator of matter. He is perfectly satisfied that there is design in the world, and that consequently there must have been a designer. It does not occur to him that it is necessary to account for the existence of an infinite personality. He is perfectly certain that there can be no design without a designer, and he is equally certain that there can be a designer who was not designed. The absurdity becomes so great that it takes the place of a demonstration. He takes it for granted that matter was created and that its creator was not. He assumes that a creator existed from eternity, without cause, and created what is called matter out of nothing; or, whereas there was nothing, this creator made the something that we call substance.

Is it possible for the human mind to conceive of an infinite personality? Can it imagine a beginningless being, infinitely powerful and intelligent? If such a being existed, then there must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been an eternity during which nothing did exist except this being; because, if the universe was created, there must have been a time when it was not, and back of that there must have been an eternity during which nothing but an infinite personality existed. Is it possible to imagine an infinite intelligence dwelling for an eternity in infinite nothing? How could such a being be intelligent? What was there to be intelligent about? There was but one thing to know, namely, that there was nothing except this being. How could such a being be powerful? There was nothing to exercise force upon. There was nothing in the universe to suggest an idea. Relations could not exist—except the relation between infinite intelligence and infinite nothing.

The next great difficulty is the act of creation. My mind is so that I cannot conceive of something being created out of nothing. Neither can I conceive of anything being created without a cause. Let me go one step further. It is just as difficult to imagine something being created with, as without, a cause. To postulate a cause does not in the least lessen the difficulty. In spite of all, this lever remains without a fulcrum. We cannot conceive of the destruction of substance. The stone can be crushed to powder, and the powder can be ground to such a fineness that the atoms can only be distinguished by the most powerful microscope, and we can then imagine these atoms being divided and subdivided again and again and again; but it is impossible for us to conceive of the annihilation of the least possible imaginable fragment of the least atom of which we can think. Consequently the mind can imagine neither creation nor destruction. From this point it is very easy to reach the generalization that the indestructible could not have been created.

These questions, however, will be answered by each individual according to the structure of his mind, according to his experience, according to his habits of thought, and according to his intelligence or his ignorance, his prejudice or his genius.

Probably a very large majority of mankind believe in the existence of supernatural beings, and a majority of what are known as the civilized nations, in an infinite personality. In the realm of thought majorities do not determine. Each brain is a kingdom, each mind is a sovereign.

The universality of a belief does not even tend to prove its truth. A large majority of mankind have believed in what is known

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as God, and an equally large majority have as implicitly believed in what is known as the Devil. These beings have been inferred from phenomena. They were produced for the most part by ignorance, by fear, and by selfishness. Man in all ages has endeavored to account for the mysteries of life and death, of substance, of force, for the ebb and flow of things, for earth and star. The savage, dwelling in his cave, subsisting on roots and reptiles, or on beasts that could be slain with club and stone, surrounded by countless objects of terror, standing by rivers, so far as he knew, without source or end, by seas with but one shore, the prey of beasts mightier than himself, of diseases strange and fierce, trembling at the voice of thunder, blinded by the lightning, feeling the earth shake beneath him, seeing the sky lurid with the volcano's glare,—fell prostrate and begged for the protection of the Unknown.

In the long night of savagery, in the midst of pestilence and famine, through the long and dreary winters, crouched in dens of darkness, the seeds of superstition were sown in the brain of man. The savage believed, and thoroughly believed, that everything happened in reference to him; that he by his actions could excite the anger, or by his worship placate the wrath, of the Unseen. He resorted to flattery and prayer. To the best of his ability he put in stone, or rudely carved in wood, his idea of this god. For this idol he built a hut, a hovel, and at last a cathedral. Before these images he bowed, and at these shrines, whereon he lavished his wealth, he sought protection for himself and for the ones he loved. The few took advantage of the ignorant many. They pretended to have received messages from the Unknown. They stood between the helpless multitude and the gods. They were the carriers of flags of truce. At the court of heaven they presented the cause of man, and upon the labor of the deceived they lived.

The Christian of to-day wonders at the savage who bowed before his idol; and yet it must be confessed that the god of stone answered prayer and protected his worshippers precisely as the Christian's God answers prayer and protects his worshippers to-day.

My mind is so that it is forced to the conclusion that substance is eternal; that the universe was without beginning and will be without end; that it is the one eternal existence; that relations are transient and evanescent; that organisms are produced and vanish; that forms change,—but that the substance of things is from eternity to eternity. It may be that planets are born and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

die, that constellations will fade from the infinite spaces, that countless suns will be quenched,—but the substance will remain.

The questions of origin and destiny seem to be beyond the powers of the human mind.

Heredity is on the side of superstition. All our ignorance pleads for the old. In most men there is a feeling that their ancestors were exceedingly good and brave and wise, and that in all things pertaining to religion their conclusions should be followed. They believe that their fathers and mothers were of the best, and that that which satisfied them should satisfy their children. With a feeling of reverence they say that the religion of their mother is good enough and pure enough and reasonable enough for them. In this way the love of parents and the reverence for ancestors have unconsciously bribed the reason and put out, or rendered exceedingly dim, the eyes of the mind.

There is a kind of longing in the heart of the old to live and die where their parents lived and died—a tendency to go back to the homes of their youth. Around the old oak of manhood grow and cling these vines. Yet it will hardly do to say that the religion of my mother is good enough for me, any more than to say the geology, or the astronomy, or the philosophy of my mother is good enough for me. Every human being is entitled to the best he can obtain; and if there has been the slightest improvement on the religion of the mother, the son is entitled to that improvement, and he should not deprive himself of that advantage by the mistaken idea that he owes it to his mother to perpetuate, in a reverential way, her ignorant mistakes.

If we are to follow the religion of our fathers and mothers, our fathers and mothers should have followed the religion of theirs. Had this been done, there could have been no improvement in the world of thought. The first religion would have been the last, and the child would have died as ignorant as the mother. Progress would have been impossible, and on the graves of ancestors would have been sacrificed the intelligence of mankind.

We know, too, that there has been the religion of the tribe, of the community, and of the nation, and that there has been a feeling that it was the duty of every member of the tribe or community, and of every citizen of the nation, to insist upon it that the religion of that tribe, of that community, of that nation, was better than that of any other. We know that all the prejudices

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against other religions, and all the egotism of nation and tribe, were in favor of the local superstition. Each citizen was patriotic enough to denounce the religions of other nations and to stand firmly by his own. And there is this peculiarity about man: he can see the absurdities of other religions while blinded to those of his own. The Christian can see clearly enough that Mohammed was an imposter. He is sure of it, because the people of Mecca who were acquainted with him declared that he was no prophet; and this declaration is received by Christians as a demonstration that Mohammed was not inspired. Yet these same Christians admit that the people of Jerusalem who were acquainted with Christ rejected him; and this rejection they take as proof positive that Christ was the Son of God.

The average man adopts the religion of his country, or, rather, the religion of his country adopts him. He is dominated by the egotism of race, the arrogance of nation, and the prejudice called patriotism. He does not reason—he feels. He does not investigate—he believes. To him the religions of other nations are absurd and infamous, and their gods monsters of ignorance and cruelty. In every country this average man is taught, first, that there is a supreme being; second, that he has made known his will; third, that he will reward the true believer; fourth, that he will punish the unbeliever, the scoffer, and the blasphemer; fifth, that certain ceremonies are pleasing to this god; sixth, that he has established a church; and seventh, that priests are his representatives on earth. And the average man has no difficulty in determining that the god of his nation is the true God; that the will of this true God is contained in the sacred scriptures of his nation; that he is one of the true believers, and that the people of other nations—that is, believing other religions—are scoffers; that the only true church is the one to which he belongs; and that the priests of his country are the only ones who have had or ever will have the slightest influence with this true God. All these absurdities to the average man seem self-evident propositions; and so he holds all other creeds in scorn, and congratulates himself that he is a favorite of the one true God.

If the average Christian had been born in Turkey, he would have been a Mohammedan; and if the average Mohammedan had been born in New England and educated at Andover, he would have regarded the damnation of the heathen as the "tidings of great joy."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nations have eccentricities, peculiarities, and hallucinations, and these find expression in their laws, customs, ceremonies, morals, and religions. And these are in great part determined by soil, climate, and the countless circumstances that mould and dominate the lives and habits of insects, individuals, and nations. The average man believes implicitly in the religion of his country, because he knows nothing of any other and has no desire to know. It fits him because he has been deformed to fit it, and he regards this fact of fit as an evidence of its inspired truth.

Has a man the right to examine, to investigate, the religion of his own country—the religion of his father and mother? Christians admit that the citizens of all countries not Christian have not only this right, but that it is their solemn duty. Thousands of missionaries are sent to heathen countries to persuade the believers in other religions not only to examine their superstitions, but to renounce them, and to adopt those of the missionaries. It is the duty of a heathen to disregard the religion of his country and to hold in contempt the creed of his father and of his mother. If the citizens of heathen nations have the right to examine the foundations of their religion, it would seem that the citizens of Christian nations have the same right. Christians, however, go further than this; they say to the heathen: You must examine your religion, and not only so, but you must reject it; and, unless you do reject it, and, in addition to such rejection, adopt ours, you will be eternally damned. Then these same Christians say to the inhabitants of a Christian country: You must not examine; you must not investigate; but whether you examine or not, you must believe, or you will be eternally damned.

If there be one true religion, how is it possible to ascertain which of all the religions the true one is? There is but one way. We must impartially examine the claims of all. The right to examine involves the necessity to accept or reject. Understand me, not the right to accept or reject, but the necessity. From this conclusion there is no possible escape. If, then, we have the right to examine, we have the right to tell the conclusion reached. Christians have examined other religions somewhat, and they have expressed their opinion with the utmost freedom—that is to say, they have denounced them all as false and fraudulent; have called their gods idols and myths, and their priests impostors.

The Christian does not deem it worth while to read the Koran.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Probably not one Christian in a thousand ever saw a copy of that book. And yet all Christians are perfectly satisfied that the Koran is the work of an impostor. No Presbyterian thinks it is worth his while to examine the religious systems of India; he knows that the Brahmins are mistaken, and that all their miracles are falsehoods. No Methodist cares to read the life of Buddha, and no Baptist will waste his time studying the ethics of Confucius. Christians of every sort and kind take it for granted that there is only one true religion, and that all except Christianity are absolutely without foundation. The Christian world believes that all the prayers of India are unanswered; that all the sacrifices upon the countless altars of Egypt, of Greece, and of Rome were without effect. They believe that all these mighty nations worshipped their gods in vain; that their priests were deceivers or deceived; that their ceremonies were wicked or meaningless; that their temples were built by ignorance and fraud, and that no God heard their songs of praise, their cries of despair, their words of thankfulness; that on account of their religion no pestilence was stayed; that the earthquake and volcano, the flood and storm went on their ways of death—while the real God looked on and laughed at their calamities and mocked at their fears.

We find now that the prosperity of nations has depended, not upon their religion, not upon the goodness or providence of some god, but on soil and climate and commerce, upon the ingenuity, industry, and courage of the people, upon the development of the mind, on the spread of education, on the liberty of thought and action; and that in this mighty panorama of national life, reason has built and superstition has destroyed.

Being satisfied that all believe precisely as they must, and that religions have been naturally produced, I have neither praise nor blame for any man. Good men have had bad creeds, and bad men have had good ones. Some of the noblest of the human race have fought and died for the wrong. The brain of man has been the trysting-place of contradictions. Passion often masters reason, and "the state of man, like to a little kingdom, suffers then the nature of an insurrection."

In the discussion of theological or religious questions, we have almost passed the personal phase, and we are now weighing arguments instead of exchanging epithets and curses. They who really seek for truth must be the best of friends. Each knows that his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire can never take the place of fact, and that, next to finding truth, the greatest honor must be won in honest search.

We see that many ships are driven in many ways by the same wind. So men, reading the same book, write many creeds and lay out many roads to heaven. To the best of my ability, I have examined the religions of many countries and the creeds of many sects. They are much alike, and the testimony by which they are substantiated is of such a character that to those who believe is promised an eternal reward. In all the sacred books there are some truths, some rays of light, some words of love and hope. The face of savagery is sometimes softened by a smile—the human triumphs, and the heart breaks into song. But in these books are also found the words of fear and hate, and from their pages crawl serpents that coil and hiss in all the paths of men.

For my part, I prefer the books that inspiration has not claimed. Such is the nature of my brain that Shakespeare gives me greater joy than all the prophets of the ancient world. There are thoughts that satisfy the hunger of the mind. I am convinced that Humboldt knew more of geology than the author of Genesis; that Darwin was a greater naturalist than he who told the story of the flood; that Laplace was better acquainted with the habits of the sun and moon than Joshua could have been, and that Haeckel, Huxley, and Tyndall know more about the earth and stars, about the history of man, the philosophy of life—more that is of use, ten thousand times—than all the writers of the sacred books.

I believe in the religion of reason—the gospel of this world; in the development of the mind, in the accumulation of intellectual wealth, to the end that man may free himself from superstitious fear, to the end that he may take advantage of the forces of nature to feed and clothe the world.

Let us be honest with ourselves. In the presence of countless mysteries; standing beneath the boundless heaven sown thick with constellations; knowing that each grain of sand, each leaf, each blade of grass, asks of every mind the answerless question; knowing that the simplest thing defies solution; feeling that we deal with the superficial and the relative, and that we are forever eluded by the real, the absolute,—let us admit the limitations of our minds, and let us have the courage and the candor to say: We do not know.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW METHOD OF VOTING.

BY

THE HON. CHARLES T. SAXTON, NEW YORK STATE SENATOR-ELECT,
THE GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS,
THE GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT,
GEN. WILLIAM MAHONE, OF VIRGINIA.

The growing interest in ballot reform has induced us to invite Senator-elect Saxton, the originator of the Saxton Bill, to explain the form and purposes of that measure, and to point out wherein it differs from the laws that went into operation at the recent elections in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The Governors of those States have also been kind enough to indicate, for the benefit of the readers of THE REVIEW, the extent to which the recent elections have cast light upon the working of the new laws. The necessity of reform of some nature is forcibly suggested by General Mahone's contribution, which illustrates the doubts so often entertained by adherents of all parties as to the officially-declared results of elections conducted under the old methods. EDITOR N. A. R.

SENATOR-ELECT SAXTON:

I AM requested by the present editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to state wherein the New York ballot measure vetoed last spring differs from the secret-ballot acts recently passed in Connecticut and Massachusetts. It is with pleasure that I accede to this request, because I recall the great interest that Mr. Thorndike Rice, the late distinguished editor of THE REVIEW, manifested in the subject. Indeed, my first inspiration in this line was drawn from his efforts in this direction and the draft of a bill made by him and published in the New York papers two or three years ago.

The brief space at my disposal will only permit me to answer the question in the most general way. The prominent features

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the New York bill were (1) that all ballots should be printed at public expense and delivered to voters by duly qualified officers; (2) that they should contain the names of all candidates nominated for a particular office; (3) that the voter should be entirely shielded from observation while preparing his ballot.

The Connecticut statute permits parties to print their own ballots upon official blanks furnished by the Secretary of State. The ballots are to be uniform in appearance. Any person may receive as many of these official blanks as he wishes upon payment of their actual cost. The Secretary of State must also deliver to the various town clerks, for the use of electors, envelopes of a certain size stamped with the seal of the State. At the entrance to each polling-place are an "envelope booth" and "a ballot booth, at which the voter may obtain ballots of any political party that he may desire"; each in charge of two persons not of the same political party, "who shall be appointed by the registrars." Adjoining the room where the ballot-box is placed are booths where the voter may enclose his ballot in the envelope "secure from outside observation." From the examination I have given this act itself, I infer that its practical operation is about as follows: The voter receives his party ballots in the presence of the two persons having charge of the ballot booth. At the envelope booth an official envelope is given to him, indorsed by the two persons designated for that purpose. He then goes into a private room, if he chooses, and encloses his ballot in the envelope, which he securely seals. Then passing into the pooling-place, where only the election officers and challengers are permitted to remain, he hands the envelope to the box-tender, who deposits it in the ballot-box.

The Connecticut law is doubtless good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. A party ballot cannot be a secret ballot. One of the cardinal principles of ballot reform is that no ballot should be allowed to go outside the polling-place and that no ballot should be valid that comes from the outside. The provision that places partisans in charge of the ballot booth gives poll-workers the opportunity they seek of ascertaining what party ballot the voter selects.

The Massachusetts law is essentially the same as the New York bill, although differing from it in many details. They contain substantially the same provisions for making and certifying nomi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nations. Each prohibits the use of any but an official ballot, and requires the voter to prepare his ticket in a private booth. They differ mainly in their provisions as to the form of the ballots and the method of getting them into the hands of the election officers.

The Massachusetts law prescribes that there shall be but one ballot, which shall contain the names of all candidates for any office whose nominations have been duly made. These names shall be arranged in alphabetical order under the designation of the proper office, except that the names of candidates for Presidential elector shall be arranged in groups. "There shall also be added to all the names of candidates their party or political designation." All ballots, except those for use in city elections, are to be prepared by the Secretary of the Commonwealth. He is required to send two sets of them in sealed packages, "at different times and by different methods," to each town clerk, a certain number of hours before the day of election. One set is for distribution to the different polling-places in the town. The second set is sent as a precautionary measure, and is only to be used in case of necessity.

The New York bill, instead of the "blanket" ballot, required separate ballots for the different classes of officers. In other words, the various ballots indorsed "State," "County," etc., provided for by existing laws, were to be retained. The names of all nominees for the same office were to be placed upon one ballot, but grouped together under party names, so that the elector might vote for an entire group by making the proper mark opposite the party name at the head of such group. The ballots were to be printed by the county clerks, instead of the Secretary of State, and delivered by them to the election officers on the morning of election day. There was no provision for printing more than one set of ballots, but in case the ballots should not be delivered, for any reason, *fac-simile* unofficial ballots might be used.

These are the main points of difference between the two measures. While they call for careful consideration, they do not touch any vital question. The principles underlying them are identical.

CHARLES T. SAXTON.

THE GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS:

BY THE election of the 5th of November in this Commonwealth a full and fair test of the so-called "Australian ballot" was effected. Enacted by the Legislature of 1888, the law which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gave to this system of voting form and life did not take effect until the present year, and the interval was improved by study of the measure, which made its provisions familiar to all who take an active interest in elections, while the most indifferent could not escape some knowledge of its provisions, so thorough has been the discussion in the press and from many platforms.

The first of the advantages of the measure to be brought out conspicuously was that the nominations were made at least fourteen days before the date of the election. This produced two desirable results: that the character and fitness of the candidates could be considered with care, and that those who were nominated, either by caucuses or conventions or by papers filed by their friends, could withdraw from the candidacy in which they had been placed, without prejudicing themselves or others by what might have been considered hasty action.

More important, however, was the provision by the Commonwealth of all the ballots. Here was struck a severe blow at corruption in politics. When the printing of ballots was in the hands of the party committees, it was possible that grave injustice might be done by the accidental or intentional omission of the name of a candidate; and it was also possible that candidates might be assessed to an altogether unreasonable amount, if the intimation were given or the threat made that, unless such assessment were paid, their names would not appear on the ballots. In other words, by this provision one of the most powerful of the weapons of the professional politician was taken from him.

This providing by the Commonwealth of all the ballots used is one of the most important means by which secrecy in voting is secured. As all the names of all the nominees to be voted for were placed on the same sheet of paper, there were no means of so marking the ballots that any one could tell to which candidates a voter gave preference.

The distribution of these ballots at every polling-place by those specially appointed to do that work is another excellent feature of this system of voting. This change made the polling-places differ greatly from what they have been. Hitherto the approaches to them, and their entrances, have been frequented by vote-distributors, acting in the interests of the various parties and candidates, and their importunities and rudeness caused serious annoyance to those to whom good manners are of importance. At the late

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

election this nuisance was entirely abated. The "striker" and the "heeler" could not have been pleased with the change, but the average citizen found that it removed a grievance of long standing, the weight of which he had never before fully realized.

In the actual voting there was no difficulty. The ballots were so made up, and so much had been written and said about them, that every one was prepared, on arriving at the polling-places, to mark his ballot as he saw fit, and to do this speedily. In places where more than three hundred were to vote at one poll, counting was slow; but where the number of voters was three hundred or less, the returns were made with surprising rapidity and, as recounts have already shown, with remarkable accuracy.

This election has been the best test of the "reading and writing" qualification of the State constitution that has ever been had. That a man might vote intelligently he was obliged to use both knowledge and judgment; and the results achieved show that the voters of this Commonwealth are fully as well informed as they have been credited with being.

No one would seriously consider the repeal of this election law, and a consequent return to the old election methods. Men of all shades of political opinion agree that the measure has worked well, and that it is a permanent part of the statutes of Massachusetts. In its details some changes may be deemed necessary, but in its main principles it is beyond adverse criticism. It secures absolute freedom from party dictation; it gives opportunity for wise and careful choice; it makes every voter directly responsible to himself for his individual action. To inaugurate the working of this statute has cost a large sum of money, but the results achieved are well worth all that has been expended.

OLIVER AMES.

THE GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT:

THE chief points of our law are *secrecy*, secured by the booth-system, in which ballots can be arranged by the individual voter; the prohibition of *ticket-peddling* within one hundred feet of the polling-place; and the use of *official paper* upon which tickets shall be printed, of the size and in type prescribed by the Secretary of State; also the use of an *official envelope* furnished by the State, in which the ballots cast must be placed, and the envelope sealed before being deposited in the ballot-box.

The law is as simple as it could well be and yet prove at all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effective to accomplish its purpose. Under its provisions every voter can cast an absolutely secret ballot, if he so desires; yet I do not regard our experience in this State at our local elections held in October as sufficient to justify any expression of opinion as to the merits of the law under which it was conducted. The vote was only about one-half the registered vote of the State, and the election was for town officials only. Our plan of minority representation in vogue for many years, and the disposition of our people to retain tried officials in their places, prevent generally any contest. Until we test the law in a general State election, it would be premature to form a definite conclusion as to its working.

MORGAN G. BULKELEY.

GENERAL MAHONE:

UNTIL further details have been gathered in from all the precincts of the State, it will be impossible to give a full idea of the frauds and outrages that have been perpetrated during the recent election in Virginia. The Democratic managers, having discovered that their canvass at the very start fell flat, and that the masses of their voters could not be aroused to take part in their campaign, while everywhere the Republicans were hopeful and in dead earnest, and further discovering that large numbers of Democrats were coming over to us, reached the conclusion that they were badly beaten, and that only the most fraudulent employment of the election machinery, which they controlled at every precinct, could save them. Thereupon they placed their whole reliance on this for defeating the popular will. So it was expected that they would go to excesses; and never in the history of the State has fraud run riot more unblushingly over the sacred right of suffrage. Counties that gave our late Presidential ticket 1,700 majority have been, by open and violent fraud, made to give 500 Democratic majority now. The presence of Federal supervisors in the Presidential election gave us measureable protection at that time. In this State election, however, there was and could be no remedy. All the while Democratic voters made public boasts that, no matter how many votes the Republicans secured, the Democrats had the machinery and would count them out. Their officers gave direction to this plan of campaign from the first, and fraud was the only agency employed throughout the campaign. Nowhere did their candidates pretend to discuss issues.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a specimen of the frauds perpetrated the following table may not be uninteresting :

THE VOTE OF NORFOLK COUNTY, NOVEMBER 5, 1889, AS SHOWN BY THE TALLY-SHEETS KEPT AT EACH POLLING-PLACE, NOT INCLUDING ANY DOUBTFUL VOTES :

Name of Precinct.	*Republican.*	*Democratic.*	*Name of Precinct.*	*Republican.*	*Democratic.*
Indian Creek	118	83	Hall's Corner	239	102
Hickory Grove	90	108	Churchland	260	92
Bell's Mill	48	122	Bowen Hill	176	59
Bethel	284	212	Deep Creek	266	108
Oak Grove	83	79	East Berkley	523	31
West Berkley	204	373	Glebe	374	80
Huntersville	421	61			
Zion's Church	166	175	Total	3,486	1,785
Cross Roads	270	100			

Republican majority polled	1,701
Republican voters in line when polls closed at Glebe	250
Republican voters in line when polls closed at Hall's Corner	160
Republicans refused votes on transfer at East Berkley	110
Republicans offering to vote at West Berkley whose names were stricken from book	30
Republican majority proper	2,251
NOTE.—Republican majority proper	2,251
Democratic majority returned	496
Number of votes stolen by Democrats	2,747

Here, as elsewhere, and everywhere in every county and city of the State, the Democratic managers had absolute control of the polls, and here, as elsewhere, the election judges were appointed the night before election day, while the law provides that they shall be appointed in March. Those who may have been appointed then and could not be induced to engage in the general scheme of robbery planned and prescribed by the Democratic managers were compelled by one means and another to give way for those who would. By this report, every statement of which can be sustained by the voters themselves, it appears that the Republican ticket was cheated out of 2,747 votes at the polls, not counting those who had been disfranchised on Saturday, October 26, by the unlawful process of the Democratic managers in "purging the polls," as they say.

This return from one county shows that, whereas the Republican ticket was entitled to a majority of 2,251, the Democratic managers gave the county to the Democratic ticket by a fraudulent majority of 496.

As yet we have heard of but two counties where the like methods were not applied, and in these two counties our Republican majorities were increased.

WILLIAM MAHONE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE AMERICAN CONSULAR SERVICE.

IT IS surprising that, with all that has been said, argued, and attempted to be done to reform our civil service during the past ten years, so little attention has been paid by orators and legislators to the need of reforming the consular system. For if there is any branch of the public service to which the ordinarily-accepted maxims of civil-service reform should apply, which needs a thorough overhauling and readjustment on a business basis, it is that branch to which the commercial interests and the individual rights of American citizenship abroad are committed. A recent writer has perhaps gone too far in saying that "the consular service is of very little benefit to the country"; but it is true that its practical reform would very greatly enlarge its benefit. Why the consular system has not been placed within the scope of the civil-service rules already established, it is difficult for any one who has any knowledge of the defects of that system—defects serious and of long continuance—to comprehend.

To our consuls abroad are committed two principal and essentially distinct tasks, according to the locality of the consulates. The principal duty of a consul at a seaport is to see that the laws relating to the American ships and crews arriving at or departing from that port are carried out; to protect the masters in their relations with the port authorities, and to protect the crews both against the masters and as temporary sojourners in a foreign land. The principal duty of a consul at an inland manufacturing or exporting town is to examine and certify to the truth of the invoices of goods exported thence to the United States. Other duties of consuls in both kinds of consulates are to protect the rights of individual American citizens when they are threatened in the locality; to make reports to the home government on the commercial condition of the consular district; and to represent the nation officially on public occasions. The gravity of these duties varies, of course, according to the importance, in its relations to the United States, of the locality; and it may be added parenthetically here that one defect of our consular system is that the salaries of consuls are very unequal, and are by no means scaled according to the relative importance and responsibilities of the consulships.

There is, moreover, another function of consuls, which is not enjoined by any law, which, indeed, it would not be easy to define in strict legal phrase, and which to some minds may present a somewhat sentimental aspect; but which, when we consider how vigorous a force sentiment has always been in influencing human affairs, should be regarded as far from unimportant. This is the duty the consul should fulfil of representing, in his person, bearing, and attainments, American enlightenment, intelligence, and refinement in the presence of a foreign community. Such a community will necessarily make large inferences as to the social condition of the country by observing its official representative. The consul, especially in a provincial city or town, is a not inconspicuous person. He dines with the mayor and other officials; he is usually invited into the best society; a place of honor is assigned him on public occasions. It is not difficult to see that his personal influence, as a result of his personal character and bearing, will be a factor in the efficient exercise of his official duties, and still less so to perceive that his personal and social qualities will have much to do with the judgment which the community will form of the mass of his countrymen.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What, then, should be the qualifications of our consuls, in order that this service should become, not a doubtful, but a large and substantial, benefit to the nation? It would seem that those qualifications should not only be readily guessed, but that they should be recognized and strictly required by the general government. That an official upon whom the duties which have been outlined are to devolve should be a man of good general education; that he should have a good knowledge of, and the power to use readily and correctly, the English language; that, if serving in Continental Europe, he should be conversant both with French and with the tongue of the country in which he is to reside; that he should have the laws regulating the consular service at his fingers' ends, and be well informed in United States commercial law, and have some familiarity, at least, with international law, would seem to be propositions above the region of dispute. And none the less clear would it seem to be that these qualifications, one and all, should be subjected to a searching examination, in accordance with the principle of civil-service reform.

But there is one important duty imposed upon consuls posted at inland importing towns, the ability to perform which cannot, perhaps, be readily ascertained by an examination made previous to its assumption. The vexed question of the undervaluation of invoices has fitfully made its appearance in public discussion during the past few years. It is a question of undoubted importance, since fraud in the importation of goods from abroad attacks both the revenues of the state and the business interests of honest merchants. There is no space here to discuss the subject of undervaluations in a large sense; but that subject nearly concerns that of the efficiency of consuls. Under our revenue system, two detectives are set upon the importations of goods into the country to see to it that these importations are in character and price what the invoices which describe them represent them to be. One of these detectives is the consul resident at the point of manufacture or export; the other is the home custom-house. Goods which are undervalued by invoice must pass both these portals in order to enter into unfair competition with honestly-invoiced goods; and if they do so pass, it is by reason of the ignorance and inefficiency of the official guardians of our commercial interests. Now it is the duty of the consul—a duty which, there can be no doubt, many consuls, under our present system, ignore and neglect—to become an expert in the goods exported to the United States from his district; to require, as he has a right to do, samples of every article described in every invoice presented to him for certification; to submit such samples, in cases of narrow margins of price and cases in which he is in doubt, to competent judges of the goods on the spot; and in case of the detection of an undervaluation, to report it promptly to the home government, and thus secure a just confiscation of goods.

Lastly, an American consul should be an American gentlemen. He should have good manners and a good address, tact, courtesy, good habits, both of business and of personal conduct, social as well as business ability. He need not in the least abate his patriotic belief in or affection for the democratic institutions and society of his own country; nor should he, on the other hand, go out of his way to manifest contempt of the different institutions of the country where he finds himself posted.

At present, as in the past, it cannot be said that consuls are selected by our government with sole or, in very many instances, with prevailing reference to their fitness to fill their offices efficiently. A consulship amid the historic monuments, the artistic splendors, and the natural beauties of the Old World, seems an enchanting prospect, not only to the hack political worker, but to the scholar and man-of-letters. No office is more eagerly sought for; and, it is not pleasant to add, no office is more frequently bestowed, without a thought as to qualifications, as a reward of personal friendship, or of political service, or as an easy method of getting rid of an importunate relative. A consul thus appointed, and indifferent to his duties, may, no doubt, spend an easy and pleasant four or eight years in Europe. A conscientious and efficient consul, on the other hand, will find his duties grave, and will accept and respond to serious responsibilities.

To make the consular service really efficient and valuable to the country, then, it should be placed within the scope of the civil-service rules. An examination

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should prove the candidate to be generally intelligent, endowed with business capacities, skilful and correct in his English, possessing a good knowledge of French and the language of the country of his residence, and endowed with a good character, good habits, and good manners. Efficient service in the consulate should insure not only retention in office, but promotion in due course. This would remove from the consul not only the feeling that it was not worth while to attend to his duties, since his removal was probable at the end of his term, but the temptation to "make the most" of his tenure so long as it existed.

There is only one more feature of the service apparently capable of improvement, which can just be touched upon. The consuls in Europe are, at the best, three thousand miles from their responsible chief. Would it not be well to create a superior officer nearer at hand? Would not the service be improved if the consul-general at the chief centre of a country—say at London or Paris—should be made the responsible chief of the consuls resident in that country, keeping watch over them, giving them instructions when necessary, and consulting with them as occasion demanded?

GEORGE MAKEPEACE TOWLE.

II.

A LEGISLATIVE KINDERGARTEN.

THIS great land of ours abounds in all sorts of educational institutions. In one cooking is taught, and the graduates on exhibition offer doughnuts and croquettes, instead of essays and disquisitions. Others take a grist of raw boys and run them through the hopper of applied journalism. Others, again, teach political economy according to the American plan, which abhors reason and theory. Telegraphy, type-writing, plumbing—but I am not Walt Whitman and I fear my catalogue would be as dull as the second book of the "Iliad." Besides, I do not wish now to be eulogistic, but suggestive, and to point out a lack. There is one great lack that, it is surprising to me, has as yet never suggested itself to the enlightened minds of our Republic. And that is a legislative kindergarten.

It is a perpetual surprise to most people that Congress each year accomplishes so little and wastes so much. There is a gathering of men chosen presumably for superior merit or talent or experience. Most towns are rather proud that Senator So-and-so or Mr. Blank, M. C., lives within their limits. We may indulge in sarcasm, but we are glad to see "my friend the Senator." Each man in Congress may be considered to be in some way above the average. Why on earth, then, is the aggregate of these great men so disappointing? It is a curious phenomenon: a session of Congress is a disorderly bedlam, a seat of idiotic gambols, a pathetic ambuscade of incompetency, a bear-pit of rascality, where all that should be done is neglected and everything unworthy is perpetrated. Not one single man out of that assembly would ever think of doing such foolish things as they all do when put together. It is almost incomprehensible; but the explanation is utterly simple—so simple, in fact, that so far as I know it has never been pointed out.

It is this: each new legislature is an infant, and as irresponsible as an infant. You do not expect staid gravity from a yearling. What is an infant? His little body, so apparently fresh and new, is made up of constituents that are as old as the hills. Star-dust may make the circuit of his veins; the perished leviathan that swallowed Jonah may, by only a few metamorphoses, be built into his bones; Solomon's very brain may be represented in his occiput. He is the resultant of a million intellects—who knows? His spirit may be the spirit reborn of one who but a twelvemonth back, was expecting obedience and most loath to render it. Then, again, so far as we know, thousands of living organisms swarm through his frame, as conscious of their own happiness, and as unconscious of his, as devoted to their own affairs, as long-lived in proportion, as any man. Yet that infant, bristling with all ages, full of all wisdoms, containing a macrocosm, kicks up its heels, crows, creeps into the fire, carries his spoon to the ear instead of the mouth, is toothless, helpless, vacuous, cruel, everything bad and everything good, the darling of our hearts, and the last person to look to for practical wisdom!

So the legislature, made up of separate Solons, becomes a new entity, as hope

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less, as helpless, as pitiable as a new-born babe. It sprawls, it clutches at the moon it indulges in senseless cries, it has the colic, it crawls for any bright light that attracts it. Thus it often falls into the fire. And the greater entity, the country, the mother of it, she who brought it forth in travail, looks on and endures its imperious moods and forgives its impudent mewling. Doubtless the spark of Plato that is imbedded in my brain protests loudly at my folly, and so throughout the land men grumble at Congress and wish they were there to be wiser. But the wisest would be just as foolish in the foolish whole.

But in the case of the child, as soon as he gets out of his swaddling-clothes he is sent to a kindergarten, which is an institution for organized laziness. He is, at least, kept out of mischief, and his spirit of destructiveness and waste is turned into harmless channels. I would propose, therefore, to have a kindergarten for legislatures, It could be arranged this way: the first year, or possibly the first two years, of its corporate existence should be merely experimental. It might pass as many laws as it cared to spend the time on, but none of them should take effect. Meantime the legislature last elected would have been somewhat schooled and have come out of that foolish stage, and might be entrusted with some genuine functions. The details of this kindergarten can be easily worked out; but the suggestion I offer with no mistrust that there will be seen in it any insidious plea for a revolution in our government or a suggestion for a tenure of office dependent on something as fickle as the "popular will."

N. H. DOLE.

III.

HOW TO SUPPRESS QUACKERY.

DR. AUSTIN FLINT, in the October issue of THE REVIEW, outlines a plan which, he thinks, if adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, would also be adopted by all the other States in the Union, and do much towards closing the door of quackery in the medical profession, which now stands so wide open. Many of the provisions of the proposed act are very excellent, but the opening article would, I think, prevent the regents of the State University from giving the plan a moment's consideration. The article reads as follows:

"I. The regents of the University of the State of New York to appoint a board of medical examiners, to consist of fourteen members, seven to be nominated by the unsectarian medical colleges empowered to confer the degree of M.D. in the State of New York, and to be teachers in said colleges, and seven to be nominated by the unsectarian State medical societies; the board to be so constituted that there shall be two examiners for each of the seven subjects of practice of medicine, surgery, obstetrics, materia medica and therapeutics, physiology, anatomy, chemistry and the collateral branches."

I do not believe the State will ever lower the dignity of its University or insult its officers by permitting any medical school or society to dictate to them in the appointment of their committees. The same power which made the State University can unmake it, and its officers will be pretty careful how they violate in their work the strict principles of justice to all.

In the discussion of the question of a "State board of medical examiners" before the Senate committee last winter, I was present by special invitation. I stated that I believed an arrangement could be made by which the license to practise medicine by a board of examiners of one State would be good in every State when the provisions of their boards of examiners were the same. I argued that the board of examiners of this State should be appointed by the regents of the State University, of which the medical schools form a part; the examinations to be written in answer to questions selected by the regents from those sent them by the examiners; the name of the student and the college from which he graduated being in no case communicated to the examiners. I recommended also that there should be no examiner in therapeutics, but the student, having mastered the groundwork of his profession and familiarized himself with the physiological action of remedial agents, should be left to his own judgment in their application. As the examination papers would be deposited in the archives of the University for future reference in case of supposed injustice, there could be no possible chance of favoritism, and all the colleges would stand or fall solely on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their own merits. These suggestions were cordially indorsed by the representives of the old school as being, in their estimation, a just and practical solution of the whole question, and undeniably not only in the interest of the public, whose servants we all claim to be, but also of every educated member of the profession.

EGBERT GUERNSEY, M. D.

IV.

A CHANCE FOR MILLIONAIRES.

THE opportunity awaits the man. In New York city to-day there is the chance for one or more persons of great wealth to make for themselves name and fame undying; to win the gratitude, respect, and admiration, not only of the United States, but of all America, of the whole civilized world; a chance to make their memory revered as long as the government shall last. And all this with little effort, as far as the millionaires are personally concerned.

There are men possessed of noble ideas and generous spirits who are anxiously searching for a way to benefit mankind through a proper disposition of their property. To them is this article addressed. It is written to suggest a plan for founding an institution which would be more far-reaching than any college, which would accomplish untold good, which would make evil-doers of whatever station tremble, which would aid struggling humanity to better its condition; an institution more powerful than pulpit, stage, or forum,—an absolutely truthful, unprejudiced, independent, daily paper, whose news columns shall tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and whose editorials shall discuss both sides of every important question.

The vast power of American journalism cannot be denied, even fettered as it is on all sides. It accomplishes much good, but it also is responsible for much evil. Prejudiced, fearful, and often corrupt as is the press of to-day, it still remains the most influential factor in American civilization. In this respect all else sinks into insignificance beside it; and yet its bulwarks have been raised at an awful expense to good morals and good government.

Who is foolish enough to play the races on newspaper "tips"? Why does one journal suppress all but bare mention of a certain railroad accident, while another publishes a column account of the same? Why do papers cater respectively to the Irish, the German, the Italian vote? Why does one fight Catholicism, and a second war upon Protestants? Why do newspapers support party candidates, whether the latter are known to be honest men or the veriest scoundrels in the ward?

Every day an irresponsible reporter or correspondent hurls misery, shame, disgrace, upon some family for the sole purpose of lengthening his space bill. Within a month two suicides have been recorded whose causes are ascribed to the publication of certain articles. The men who took their own lives may not have been mentally sound; but is that any reason why homes should be invaded by unscrupulous ghouls of the press?

The journal of to-day is edited from the counting-room. The ideal newspaper has not yet made its appearance. The editorial and the business departments should be absolutely independent of each other. The paper should speak the truth, no matter how its advertising patronage or its political "pull" is affected.

A free and unsubsidized press—where will you find it? Papers all over the land will rise up, and each, patting itself, cry "Here!" But those in command know that the daily paper which prints the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, the daily paper whose editorial opinions are absolutely fearless and unprejudiced, does not exist in the United States.

The ideal paper should print in its news columns nothing but that which has been verified. Readers might not get particulars of a race war so soon as in one of the present "enterprising" journals; but when published in the ideal paper the news could be absolutely relied upon. The editorials should discuss in parallel columns both sides of leading questions. For example, articles advocating free trade and protection should appear simultaneously. In the case of a great strike, one column should contain the employer's views, another the laborer's arguments. Chicago should have the chance of putting forth her reasons for wanting the World's Fair as well as New York. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern and the Northern sides of the race problem should both be discussed. The paper should argue for and against every great question, local, national, international. Then could the people read, reflect, and decide who and what is the right.

Would such an impartial journal pay? Perhaps not in money at first. But the people of the United States are willing to be convinced; they want the best government, the best officials, the best of everything. That paper in time would be read from Maine to California, and beyond the seas. Its influence would be inestimable, its power transcendent. Evil-doers of whatever party and station, rich or poor, black or white, alien or native, would fear it. Good citizens would eagerly support it. The poor would pray for its success.

The ideal paper should not be pledged to support any party, community, state, or government. It should be nothing less than the exponent of humanity. And it must occupy this grand plane if not an advertisement is received, if not a single copy is sold. How can this be accomplished? Here lies the millionaire's chance to see his name grouped with those who have made nations, who have conferred lasting benefits upon mankind.

Endow such a paper as colleges are endowed. Let it be managed by a board of trustees. Let the employees represent the faculty; the readers, the students. Pay salaries large enough to command the best editors, writers, and publishers. Have the trustees select for these various positions men of integrity, of broad minds, of education, ability, culture, and noble ideas. Be liberal, so that they will put forth continually their best efforts. Guarantee to the paper a regular income, that it may be published day after day and decade after decade, if the advertising columns are blank, if every copy has to be given away.

The time is ripe, the people are anxious, the field is unoccupied. A great daily paper which could be relied upon absolutely would be a monument forever to its founders.

Where is the man or the group of men who will improve this opportunity?

HENRY E. ROOD

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED